



3 1761 11853982 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118539824>



No. 170

N° 170

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Thursday 27 February 1997

Jeudi 27 février 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

Hansard Reporting Service
3330 Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats
3330 Édifice Whitney ; 99, rue Wellesley ouest
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400 ; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 27 February 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 27 février 1997

*The House met at 1004.
Prayers.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

TEACHERS' PROTEST OPPOSITION DES ENSEIGNANTS

Mr Ed Doyle (Wentworth East): I move private member's notice of motion number 41:

That in the opinion of this House, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario should demand that union leaders stop their systematic attempt to politicize the classroom and that teachers' fundamental professionalism be left unfettered so that the trust between teachers, parents and students is not violated.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Mr Doyle, you have 10 minutes.

Mr Doyle: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I see that you've had your sling removed as I prepare for my arrows.

I'd like to start this debate today by clearly enunciating that the purpose of this resolution is to protect the professionalism of teachers. It's to ensure that the classroom and the education of our children remain above politics and that the classroom ultimately is concerned with the education of children so that they may attain the valuable tools of knowledge and pursue higher goals and opportunities. That is what this debate is about.

The recent OSSTF campaign to use the classroom as a tool for the debate on education politics and to use our children as bargaining chips severely takes away the valuable time of the classroom, not only taking children away from their path of learning on the road to future goals and opportunities, not only betraying the trust of parents who hand over their children to a school system that is supposed to educate, not indoctrinate, but also diminishing the professionalism of teachers by asking them to participate in political debate by a medium that will only cause a reduction in credibility for teachers who participate, but especially lessens the credibility of the leadership that purports to speak on their behalf.

This resolution will also clearly delineate what the boundaries are for legitimate debate as it relates to education matters and how we deal with future disagreements as we move to improve the education system over the next few months and years.

This is not to say there is not room for protest. Teachers' unions have every right to express their views in public ways, and this is exactly what they do. However, the OSSTF should not attempt to use students as pawns; to do so would greatly diminish credibility that the leadership will have when speaking on education matters.

As I have mentioned earlier, I have serious concerns about the OSSTF directing its members to expend valuable classroom time to further their partisan views in an effort to lobby Ontario's elected officials. At a time when test after test indicates that Ontario's students are indeed below average on many international exams, it would certainly be unwise to jeopardize the learning time in the classroom to areas that are clearly political and partisan in nature.

Classroom instruction is key to the future of our students. As recent performance measures confirm, Ontario students continue to perform at below average compared with their colleagues in other jurisdictions. To counter this trend, we should be maximizing our efforts to focus classroom time on teaching students what they should learn. That is why this government has decided to bring about changes in the education system to improve student achievement and accountability and focus resources on the classroom.

Bill 104 is presently before committee and is one of the pieces of legislation that sparked the OSSTF campaign. The OSSTF has concerns over Bill 104. There is ample opportunity to raise objections to any legislation we bring forth and many avenues to voice those concerns, but using our children in this battle is simply wrong.

1010

Let us analyse what this legislation really does: It reduces the number of school boards and cuts the number of trustees and their pay. This is a goal that many if not most Ontario parents agree with.

Why are we doing this? Between 1985 and 1995 school enrollment increased by 16% yet school board spending increased by 82% and property taxes increased by a tremendous 120%. This doesn't seem like accountability to me. Some may think that student achievement went up in those years. Comparative tests with other jurisdictions show that this simply isn't the case.

These changes are nothing new and many other jurisdictions have already adopted similar reforms. With these changes, parents will have a stronger direct voice in education because it will be entrenched in law that every school must have an advisory school council. These changes we are making will improve the quality of education, with accountability to the taxpayer, and cut bureaucratic waste and duplication. It will ensure that resources are focused on the classroom. That's right, we will focus resources on the classroom, which this recent OSSTF campaign would undermine.

It's my belief that school boards, parents and the majority of teachers do not condone this questionable use of classroom and student time. In fact, I'm sure that most front-line teachers have probably outright rejected this

idea — I'm sure of that — but we must still raise the issue because even though individual teachers in vast numbers reject the politicization of the classroom, the union leadership has failed in representing the views of those teachers by refusing to withdraw their commitment to this campaign of politicizing the classroom and the curriculum.

That is why today I ask this assembly to support this resolution, in that we may be able to make a statement of principle today that defends and protects the special trust between parent, teacher and student.

I'm not alone in my concerns over the attempt to recruit students and to use the classroom in an organized political campaign. Even many media outlets that are quick to question many of our government's initiatives have resoundingly raised objections to this OSSTF campaign, and I'll quote some of the editorial comments.

First, the Windsor Star says, "We can assure Mr Manners many students, parents and taxpayers will find his game plan an unacceptable and unwelcome intrusion in the halls of learning."

From the Chatham Daily News we have this quote: "Whatever battles Ontario's secondary school teachers have with the Harris government...the classroom is not the place to fight them."

The Hamilton Spectator says, "Classrooms are places for learning, not for partisan political debate, and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation should know the difference."

From the Kirkland Lake Northern Daily News we have this quote: "High school teachers in Ontario are taking their feud with the provincial government into the classroom. And that's the wrong place for any feud."

The Kitchener-Waterloo Record states: "The OSSTF has tripped over this line in a misconceived and illegitimate attempt to enlist students as soldiers in its war against education reform. Shame on the union leaders."

The Ottawa Citizen says: "Classroom time properly belongs neither to unions nor government, but to students. We hope the vast majority of Ontario's high school teachers...will resist this campaign."

The list goes on and on, but I will quote only one more. The St Catharines Standard says, "Nor should teaching and learning time be used to advance political views to a captive audience of young people who largely regard and trust teachers as authority figures."

It is this last comment from the St Catharines Standard that truly hits a chord as to why this orchestrated political campaign is so dangerous. Parents entrust the education of their children to the teacher and to the school system. It is often the experience in the classroom as much as in the home that helps to contribute to the mental and character development of our children. The positive influence that so many dedicated teachers have on our children is enormous. To engage in a political campaign with the classroom as the medium is truly a betrayal of the trust between parent and teacher and between teacher and child.

Parents have varying opinions on government policy. Some parents may agree with the initiatives we're proposing and some may disagree. But one thing is certain: Not everyone has the same opinion. This OSSTF

campaign not only assumes that it is speaking for every teacher, it assumes it is speaking for every parent, and this simply is not so.

There are many challenges ahead of us as we make changes to our education system: changes that will improve student achievement, changes that will increase accountability and parental input, change that will ensure that we arm our children with the tools they need for the next century. Those tools are knowledge.

I hope that instead of confronting each other, we can confront the future of education together to widen student knowledge so that they can indeed pursue these limitless goals and opportunities.

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): I rise to speak against the resolution. It surprises me that the member would bring forth such a resolution. We are an elected assembly of common people, elected by the common people to institute and express the will of the people. If we are here as a House of Commons, if you will, then I think it's important for us to ensure that we are governed by the same laws that apply to the people we represent, and this is where I have trouble with this resolution.

The Ministry of Education and Training has politicized the classroom more than once by ordering government documents that verge on propaganda to be sent home by teachers to the students. A recent example of this is Excellence in Education: High School Reform. Principals and teachers distributed the document. Materials on the College of Teachers and a mailing from the Ontario Parent Council also were sent home for distribution.

The Minister of Education himself has chosen schools as settings for his recent announcements. He released his secondary reform consultation document at Northview Heights Secondary School in North York. He took over the classroom and brought media in with him. Obviously the minister felt that education reform was an issue worth bringing into the classroom, even though inviting the media may have suggested to some that he had other motives.

The minister took over the resource centre of Humber Summit Middle School in November to make a non-announcement on new curriculum standards. Several classes of students, as well as the media, were in the audience for that announcement.

The minister made his announcements on Bill 104 at the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse. He held a communications meeting at the Annette Street Public School, barring the parents of the school from the school.

When those who govern consider themselves to be above the law democracy is in trouble. I would suggest that with the passing of this resolution we would be in trouble when it comes to democracy.

Just imagine the ramifications of this. Show-and-tell in kindergarten would be illegal. Current events in the junior section would be illegal. Civics at the intermediate level would no longer be legal. We would have courses in high school such as law and society that wouldn't be allowed to take place. In fact, the new reform would suggest that every student in Ontario, regardless of ability level, at the grade 10 history level take a course on government. How can you teach government without politicizing the course? It is impossible.

This resolution does not serve the better needs of Ontario students.

1020

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I rise to participate in this debate, and I am reminded of an article in the *Ottawa Citizen* on February 10 by Heather-jane Robertson, an educator in that community, in which she referred to the great Russian poet Yevtushenko, who in 1951 wrote a poem entitled *Lies*. In the poem Yevtushenko pleads with teachers to confront their students with reality and to engage with the world in all its complexity. He argues that if we don't do this as teachers, our silence is complicity in errors: "Forgive no error you recognize. It will repeat itself a hundredfold and afterward our pupils will not forgive in us what we forgave."

Yevtushenko has a good idea of what teaching and education is really about. It's about engaging students in discussion and challenging what happens in the real world. It's significant that Yevtushenko was writing in the Stalinist era and he was essentially challenging teachers in the Soviet Union to challenge what they saw as wrong in their society in their classrooms.

Surely, if we have that kind of a challenge given to teachers in that kind of an authoritarian system, a democratic system like ours would appreciate teachers bringing political issues to the classroom to challenge students to think about their society and the issues of the day. Surely we would not accept a Stalinist view that we should not engage students in discussions about political issues in their own classrooms. Frankly, I don't think the ministry accepts this view. I'm glad they don't. I'm sure that Mr Snobelen and his colleagues are not in fact supporters of a Stalinist view of education.

The minister himself has engaged in political discussion in classrooms with students, as have many other MPPs in this assembly. I was myself in Kitchener in a classroom yesterday, talking to students. I think that's something we should be doing as educators and MPPs. Teachers should be inviting political people and people from the community in to discuss issues of the day in the classrooms with the students and exposing them to different points of view so they can make their own decisions.

Surely, as the member for Sudbury just mentioned, ministry guidelines call on teachers and schools to have discussion of current events on appropriate subjects as part of the education of the kids in the classroom.

Mr W. Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew): The key word is "appropriate."

Mr Wildman: The member says the key word is "appropriate." Who is to decide what is appropriate? In the Soviet Union Stalin decided what was appropriate.

I think that MPPs, all of us, have from time to time visited classrooms and discussed the issues of the day, whether they be Bill 104, Bill 103 or many of the issues that present themselves in this Legislature. Many students agree with some of the things that various members of the assembly say; many of them disagree. I think that teachers bring other people from the community into classrooms to discuss issues of the day and to have political discussions. That's part of what education is about. It's about challenging students with new ideas and

challenging them to think, to analyse problems and make their own decisions.

I note that the Minister of Education and Training himself has chosen schools as the setting for many of his recent announcements and he has appeared with students to make announcements. He released his secondary school reform consultation document — a very controversial document about changes at the secondary level, a very political document about the education of our students — at Northview Heights Secondary School in North York, with a student audience. As a matter of fact, he took over a classroom and brought the media with him into that classroom, and I think he was quite right to have done that.

I think all these issues should be discussed in the classroom. We shouldn't be, as the member who brings this resolution forward is proposing, limiting what can be discussed around political issues, particularly issues related to education, in our classrooms. The minister certainly doesn't accept that. He also took over the resource centre at Humber Summit Middle School in November to make an announcement regarding curriculum standards, a very political document related to his view and the government's view of what they consider to be mediocre results of our education system. That in itself is a political statement. On that occasion, several classes of students as well as the media were in the audience for the announcement and participated in discussions and debate with the minister.

I think one of the things we have to keep in mind is that many times schools are criticized for not being involved in the issues of the day; for not exposing students to the real world; for somehow keeping students away from discussion and debate about issues that will matter to them as individuals, both now and in the future. Surely the member who is bringing forward this resolution is not suggesting that teachers should be censored, that teachers should not be able to bring issues, controversial issues even, before their students for discussion. What is important is that the debate be balanced and that there be issues raised on both sides. That is what is important, not deciding what is appropriate or not appropriate for discussion, but rather that the issues and the debates be brought forward in a balanced manner. That is the challenge.

I think the Ministry of Education and Training has politicized the classroom, to use the phrase. I think they should politicize the classroom. I don't think there's anything wrong with politicizing the classroom. We are in a political society, a democratic society that involves citizens of every age, whether they be voters yet or not, in issues of the day, and what is crucial is that the debate be balanced.

If the member were bringing forward a resolution arguing that controversial issues should be brought before students in classrooms by their teachers in a balanced manner, I would understand it and I could support it. But rather, he is suggesting that teachers should not bring these issues before their students. That is not acceptable. It calls into question the very purpose of education and the purpose of teaching.

As Yevtushenko said in 1951 in the Soviet Union, teachers must denounce what is wrong in their society.

Teachers must stand up for what is right against what is wrong. They must do that as role models for their students. If teachers see issues being brought forward in such a way as to endanger the education of their students, then it is incumbent upon them to "forgive no error, for it will repeat itself a hundredfold and afterwards our pupils will not forgive us what we forgave."

Mr Toni Skarica (Wentworth North): I believe the intent of this resolution is clear, that along with the Honourable John Snobelen, the Minister of Education and Training, and my colleague from Hamilton, from Wentworth East, what we are respectfully requesting is that the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation end their campaign to use classroom time to inform students about their current lobbying efforts.

The issue is one of respect. I believe the federation's position does not show due respect for the young people in Ontario classrooms. Certainly the professionalism of Ontario's teachers is not in question, but they have a stake in this issue because it is unfair to place teachers in the position where they are forced to decide whether or not to use precious classroom time to present their union's message to their students.

The crux of the issue is that the federation wishes to use its time, through its teachers, to present a one-sided message, which amounts to providing the union with free publicity. We are not talking about a two-sided argument, as the member for Algoma indicated. There is no dispute that a two-sided argument is appropriate in our classrooms. It's the one-sided argument that is in dispute here and I suggest should be condemned.

A balanced presentation is what is essential and what is required in our classrooms. The federation's intent to use classroom time to present a one-sided viewpoint is, I suggest, not appropriate. It's advertising and not debate.

In addition, there's the issue of democratic fairness. The federation proposes to present ideas shared by some teachers and by some of the students' parents. In a fair, democratic environment, students should expect to hear from many and all sides.

I want to be very clear that I'm not opposed in any way to bringing the outside world into a classroom or into this Legislature either. No one can dispute that it's a necessary and valuable part of our children's education. We want our children to be well informed about current events. However, we do not want our children to be subjected to one-sided lobbying presentations from any side, and we do not want to allocate time to advertise for one group or another.

As our children learn to participate in the democratic process, it is important that they learn to assess information, weigh arguments and learn how to come to a decision on their own without undue influence. Perhaps some of them could be MPPs one day.

1030

Members in this House who have read the editorial comments in the Ottawa Citizen, the St Catharines Standard, the Windsor Star, the Sault Star and several other newspapers will have noted recent editorials specifically addressing this issue. The view expressed in these journals is unusually consistent, that while the federation has every right to disagree with the provincial

government's agenda for education, it has a vested interest in this dispute and should not be using classroom time to encourage students to take sides.

I'd like to read a few sentences into the record. From the St Catharines Standard editorial of February 14: "We have no argument with teaching them," high school students, "about the democratic process.... However, using classroom time to recruit students to the OSSTF's political cause is an abuse of position."

The Windsor Star, February 7: "The Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation has every right to disagree with the provincial government's agenda for education, but it is irresponsible for OSSTF president Earl Manners to suggest that the battle should now be taken to the classroom floor."

February 7, the Stratford Beacon Herald editorial: "It would have been inappropriate for the local OSSTF to enlist students and parents in its quarrel with education minister John Snobelen. The teachers have a right to mount whatever political action they choose, but they have a vested interest."

Two more editorials. On February 7, from my home town, the Hamilton Spectator, the editorial stated: "Classrooms are places for learning, not for partisan debate, and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation should know the difference." Finally, February 10, the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, the editorial there states: "There is a clear line between teaching politics and preaching politics. Between teaching children and indoctrinating them. The OSSTF has tripped over this line."

The member for Sudbury referred to the document entitled Excellence in Education, the secondary school reform document. This was a consultation document. The government wanted to consult with all the stakeholders before implementing any type of reform, and in fact we received 23,000 submissions. It is, I suggest, right to ask all the stakeholders, to ask for a consultation. I applaud the member for Algoma for saying that it's fair and right, in his usual fair and objective manner.

I congratulate the vast majority of classroom teachers of this province who, unlike Mr Manners, understand what is appropriate and what is not. They know that while he is responsible for their federation, the teachers of our province have a far more important and challenging job, and that is to educate our children.

They also know, as professionals, that to use students for political purposes would undermine their own professionalism. Their reaction has been what this government has expected of teachers of this province: an understanding that while in the classroom the teacher's own interests take a second priority to providing students with a sound education, free of crass and heavy-handed attempts at enlisting students in their own cause.

I ask members to join me and Mr Doyle in requesting that the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation let the children learn how to think for themselves and drop their request for classroom time to advertise their views.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I consider this resolution to be both unnecessary and offensive. Teachers are, in my view, professionals. They are not going to politicize the classroom, and they are most certainly not

going to exploit their students. They are concerned about what this government's actions in education are going to do to their students in the future. This government has caused them to want to try and make the case for public education, but it is equally true that teachers across this province are making it absolutely clear that they are going to raise any concerns outside the classroom, that they are making a very clear distinction between their political action and what they believe to be appropriate and legitimate curriculum.

Having said that, I want to tell you that I am absolutely, totally fed up with the cynicism and the sheer hypocrisy of this government. This is a government talking about trust. This government is about to wipe out local governance for education, and the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education says it is because trustees universally, across the province, in their view, have mismanaged education. This is a government that talks about trust?

I can tell you that for parents what this government is doing is a matter of trust. Parent group after parent group and individual parent after individual parent who have come forward to our committee holding hearings on this government's Bill 104 have said loudly and clearly who they trust. They trust their local trustees. They trust local decision-making for education. They do not trust this government to make good decisions about education for their children.

The hypocrisy of this government is absolutely unbelievable. This is a government that is forcing private citizens, as well as other elected representatives, into court. They're going to do it time and time again, because they are so determined to bring forward legislation which is completely undemocratic and unprecedented in this province. They refuse to stop being autocrats, and then they challenge what has to be spent in the courts to defend democracy, while they spend \$746,000 on a television ad trying to convince people that they are improving education. As the member from Sudbury pointed out yesterday, \$746,000 is enough to provide textbooks for 1,000 classrooms. Talk about hypocrisy.

I deplore the cynicism and the hypocrisy of a government that misuses figures the way the member for Wentworth East has misused them today. I respect the member for Wentworth East, and I understand that the misuse of that information is not totally attributable to him. There is no question that he and every member of the Conservative caucus are being fed this kind of misinformation by a Minister of Education who is determined to convince people that there is a problem in education that he must fix, there is a crisis in public education that only he can deal with, a Minister of Education who then ignores all objective evidence of how wrong his actions are.

He wants to amalgamate school boards. He refuses to look at any of the evidence that there are no cost savings from amalgamation, that every study that has been done on amalgamation says big boards are less cost-effective than smaller boards. He misuses his own report, when it shows that you can only get \$150 million from amalgamating boards, and refuses to acknowledge the fact that of that \$150 million, \$9.9 million is coming directly out

of the classroom. He refuses to pay any attention to the objective evidence of what his cuts have already done to classroom education.

In the last four days of hearings here in Toronto, we have had teachers, trustees, parents and students, all those people the member for Wentworth East talks about building trust between, come to us and tell us of their very deep concerns, their distress, their fear about what this government has already done to education through its cuts, what's happening to the classrooms and their very profound fears of what will happen to classrooms in the future, what this government, which is so determined to convince people that things are wrong in education in the province of Ontario, will do to classrooms.

I suggest to you that it is no wonder people are looking for every forum they can possibly find to try to make this government listen. I can only add my pleas to the members of the government who are here today to speak to a resolution that has been brought forward to try to launch some sort of counterattack because for four days they have had people coming in and saying how disastrous their policies are, so the government wants some sort of counterattack; I can only plead with them to listen to the very real concerns that are being brought forward and to the fears of those teachers, parents and students about what they are doing to public education.

I am afraid they will follow the direction of the minister, who has shut out the concerns of the very educators and parents the member for Wentworth East claims to speak for today. Exactly who is it who is destroying trust in our education system? Any orchestrated campaign of teachers or any other group, as referred to by the member for Wentworth East, cannot compare to the campaign of this government that is being carried out at considerable cost in dollars and the loss of democracy and a threat to public education. I only ask that the members of the government understand the depth of the concern.

1040

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): I come to the debate on this motion from this perspective: I know the member for Wentworth East is a very honourable member, a member with much integrity, and maybe some of the newer members elected on the Tory side, as he himself is, should take a look at him because I think he is a very honourable member. But I'm very concerned about what this motion is all about.

In this motion, when you look at it and read it, you're saying to us as legislators and to people across the province that you want this Legislature to adopt a policy that is more suitably found in totalitarian states, where the state decides what it is that will and will not be said in a classroom when it comes to current affairs issues or political issues.

That is really dangerous, especially in a society like ours that is based on democratic rights, a society in which politics in the Legislature and the House of Commons plays a very integral role in what happens in our life. I believe fervently and strongly, and I can't affirm it any other way, that one of the things that has to happen in our classrooms for certain is that I don't want to see politicians putting their hands on the classroom by way

of motions, dictating what teachers cannot talk about in the classroom, because what they talk about there prepares the kids for when they come out into the workforce later.

If anything, I have a complaint that possibly not enough discussion about politics is happening in the classroom. We have been seeing a huge change in our society over the last 10 or 20 years, how politics has become much more complex because of the media of television and radio. People are able to open the television or listen to the radio and find out immediately what is happening in our land and what is affecting them, as it relates to what's happening both at the Legislature and the House of Commons.

One of the complaints I get a lot from people is that they sometimes don't quite understand what is going on because they don't have a good basis of what our political system is all about and how it works, because it is not taught in the classroom to the degree it needs to be.

As the member for Algoma mentioned earlier, many of us as legislators are invited on a regular basis to go into the classroom and talk to the students about what happens here in the Legislature. They invite us in as New Democrats, Liberals and Tories because some teachers want to make sure those kids get a basing in politics and understand that we have a political system, that it is a political one and that it is party politics that goes on in this place.

I believe not enough of that goes on. What we should be trying to do within the classroom is to make sure we don't only prepare children to become adept at being able to make the transition into the workforce so that they know how to read and count and work the machinery of industry, but we should also be preparing our kids for life, letting them know what our political system is all about, letting them know how it relates to them, letting them know about current affairs issues so they can come to decisions on their own, presenting to them all the points of view, not just the points of view of New Democrats or Tories but all the views, so they themselves as individuals are able better to decide what should be their belief and where they would like to go and what they would like to support and not support.

I would just say this to the member opposite: If I have one complaint as a New Democrat about what happens in the classroom in regard to teachers — let me take this a little bit differently; I'll get in trouble saying it that way — it is that the member needs to recognize that if you were to pass a motion like this and this were actually to become government policy, a vast majority of teachers tend to be fairly right-wing and you're going to be stopping them from having the ability to speak in the classroom about what is important to them when it comes to the politics of this province.

If I have a complaint it is that I think there are not enough New Democrats in the teaching profession to give our particular point of view.

Je dirais très directement au gouvernement que la motion que l'on a ici aujourd'hui est très dangereuse. Ce que le membre essaie de faire, c'est de nous dire ici à l'Assemblée que l'on doit passer une motion qui va dire aux maîtres et aux maîtresses d'école à travers la province qu'ils n'ont pas le droit d'aller dans la salle de

classe et parler de politique et de ce qui arrive couramment chaque jour dans la politique en Ontario. C'est très dangereux.

Il est très important que les élèves de la province prennent l'opportunité de savoir ce qui se passe dans la province, ce qui se passe avec le gouvernement conservateur, ce qui se passe avec le Parti libéral et avec le Nouveau Parti démocratique. Ils ont besoin de connaître toutes ces questions-là parce qu'ils vont venir au point où ils auront le droit de vote et où ils vont devenir les chefs de notre société dans les années à venir. C'est très important que ce développement politique se fasse à un jeune âge, qu'ils ont la chance d'avoir toutes les formations qu'ils peuvent avoir, avant d'entrer dans le marché de travail et avant de commencer l'âge de vote, afin de pouvoir regarder les points de vue de tous les partis politiques et regarder toutes les questions qui nous touchent ici en Ontario, afin d'être capables de se faire leurs propres idées faisant affaire avec ces questions qui nous touchent dans notre société.

Je dis au membre de Wentworth-Est, et je le connais comme étant un membre très sincère dans ses travaux ici à l'Assemblée, pensez-y deux fois : ce que vous nous demandez de faire est quelque chose qui a été vu plutôt dans une société comme celle de l'Allemagne des années 30 ou de l'Union soviétique avant les années 90, où le gouvernement disait aux écoliers et à la société ce qui était acceptable et ce qui n'était pas acceptable comme vue politique dans les classes et dans la société en général. Ce n'est pas quelque chose que nous, dans une démocratie, devons faire pour donner une direction à nos salles de classe de la province.

I will not be voting for this motion. I just say this very last thing: I find this motion somewhat hypocritical when I see a government spending how many millions of dollars on advertising on television to get its points of view to Ontarians every day, and they have a problem with teachers talking about what happens about this in the classroom.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): It's a pleasure today to rise in support of Mr Doyle's resolution. The member for Wentworth East has gone on record as being opposed to the politicizing of the classroom, and who out there could not support that view? Those who would argue we should politicize the classroom have really gone too far.

Education must, first and most importantly, be focused on the needs of the student and we all know that those are as various and as different from grade level as they are within a grade itself. Each individual student needs special attention and we need to pay attention to that.

There's a partnership in education. It's often referred to that it takes a whole community to educate a child. They must be exposed to all elements within society which, with the multimedia society we live in, they are exposed to today. On the outside you listen to the news, you watch the newspaper and you see all these things about mega this and mega that. There's plenty of politicization outside the classroom.

But there's a trusted partnership arrangement between the student, the teacher, the parent and the community. It's that trust I want to focus on. To breach that trust is

a breach of the contract or relationship between the teacher and the student and the parents. We've extended the trust based on the high regard and high respect for the role of the professional teacher in the classroom. I think the individual teachers I've met and spoken with are very much conscious of not wanting to bring all their particular union baggage into the classroom. Many of them are very concerned about being fair and honest within the classroom.

I specifically have to look at a couple of comments from the press. There's a lot of press on this issue and I'm just going to quote a couple at random. These aren't selected. "We hear the concerns that they, the teachers have, but those kinds of activities should be kept outside the classroom and our schools. That isn't the place for them. Classrooms are not going to become debating situations for the politics of the day" — Ray De Rosario, director of education, Sault Ste Marie public school board. It was in the Sault Star on February 7. That's generally reflective, and there's the director of education. I completely agree with that type of professionalism and that attitude.

1050

If we're invited into a classroom, I think we should be responding, as we all do. As members we have a duty to respond in an attempt to educate in a fair and reasonable way.

Before I wrap up — I want to share my time with another member who has another point of view on this — I want to bring to your attention that I'm invited tonight, and I'm just looking at my schedule here, to the school advisory committee and parent council. We know the composition of that council involves educators, parents, hopefully students and also community personnel. Here are the topics for the debate tonight: Bill 103, which is the Toronto city bill; Bill 104, which is the appropriate bastion of education changes; and Bill 106, which is the finance bill. So they're discussing everything, which is fine, but that's what's actually happening in the classroom.

I took some liberties and inquired with a couple of people. Each teacher and each student is being encouraged to circulate a petition which is not just dealing with education, it's dealing with all of the Harris changes, as they call it, within that petition.

I think we've gone overboard. We've broken the trust with the students, and I think we've pressured teachers, who don't want it, through union organizations, into a situation of either being on side with the union agenda or offside, and not really being allowed to care for the children entrusted to them.

I'm sharing my time with Mr Smith. Thank you very much.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): What we are seeing with this resolution is yet another attack on educators and in particular members of the teaching profession by the government of Mike Harris. It is an attack which I'm sure must embarrass the former critic in the field of education, the Honourable Dianne Cunningham, who did, I thought, a very good job as critic and would not be part of this kind of nonsense. In addition to this, it must embarrass Elizabeth Witmer, now the Minis-

ter of Labour, who was, I thought, a good chair of the board of education in the Waterloo area.

The member has obviously been put up to this. This is not his nature. The member I know for Wentworth East is not the kind of person who is a vicious or malicious person at all. I believe the Premier's office or the Minister of Education's office has suggested that this should be the topic of conversation, that it should be —

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): Mr Speaker, on a point of order —

Mr Bradley: Sit down. Don't take up my time with that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The Chair recognizes the member for Nepean on a point of order.

Mr Bradley: I'll fix you then. You want to take time —

Mr Baird: Will you agree to hear my point of order?

I think the member opposite is impugning the motives and integrity of the member for Wentworth East. I believe it's strictly against the standing orders to impugn the motives of an honourable member in this place.

The Acting Speaker: I was listening carefully to the member for St Catharines. I would like to hear him out.

Mr Bradley: Having been interrupted by somebody who obviously knows that what I'm saying is true in this House, that your government is up to this kind of campaign against educators — you know that. That's why you're reacting.

The MPP has put forward this resolution which is, as I say, designed to discredit members of the teaching profession, in my view, yet the government of Ontario is spending three quarters of a million taxpayers' dollars to have the Premier come on the television set reading a teleprompter message that is clearly designed to put forward a government position. It is unquestionably government propaganda, the worst kind of partisan propaganda, using taxpayers' dollars, and this government has the audacity to attack people who want to put before the students the issues and have those issues debated.

I'm sure those students are going to be debating them successfully. They're going to want to get all points of view, and that's going to be important. Teachers have the kind of integrity that ensures that those viewpoints are going to be put forward. I know many people in the teaching profession. They're going to bend over backwards to ensure that's the case.

It was all right for the Minister of Education to show up at some high school to make his announcement, a big grant announcement for the television cameras, with all the news media there. That's all right, but if anybody else wants to put any other point of view forward or have it discussed in the classroom, this government is going to condemn that.

MPPs have an opportunity from time to time to visit schools. I'm sure they put forward a point of view which is their point of view and one which can be challenged.

This is part of an orchestrated campaign against public sector employees. You have declared that anybody who is in the public sector, regardless of what kind of service they provide, is going to be the enemy of this government. The ads add up to \$749,878 in total. I think it is an absolute disgrace that you're engaging in this kind of

attack on people who are working very hard in the system to deliver education to our students.

It's a very challenging job. It's not the 1950s, and apparently many people on the government side are stuck in the 1950s. These people face new challenges. There are far more children from dysfunctional families who show up in the classroom now with challenges of a social nature than was the case in the 1950s. We have people from other countries coming who require special services within the system. We now have those who have disabilities integrated into the regular school system. All of this requires a lot of hard work. What you are doing is systematically destroying the morale of members of the teaching profession. This kind of resolution is designed to do that and is designed to attack them.

Why don't you simply engage in the proper kind of debate in this assembly and elsewhere? If members of this assembly wish to visit schools and be part of a discussion, let them do so, and I'm sure they would be most welcome to do so. But to engage in this is simply to engage in the kind of teacher-bashing, educator-bashing that we're seeing consistently from all the members of this government and I think it's a provincial disgrace to see this happening. It does not build a consensus that we need.

Mr Bruce Smith (Middlesex): It's certainly a pleasure as well to join in and speak in support of my colleague's resolution this morning and add some comments to those already made by the member for Durham East, who I know brings a great deal of passion to the issue of education, as well as the member for Wentworth North.

I read with interest the correspondence that the member circulated with his particular resolution and I found interesting the two stated goals that were contained in that piece of correspondence, the first being to protect and defend the professionalism of teachers in this province, and the second being that the focus of education reform should be on the classroom and not politics.

I would differ substantially with the comments made by the member for Cochrane South. I think we have to differentiate between the art of teaching political system versus the art of teaching partisan politics in the classroom.

I think there should be no mystery whatsoever in terms of the government's clear intentions to fundamentally reform education in this province. The intentions are very clear about bringing positive changes to school governance, funding and curriculum, changes which are necessary and changes which I fully understand will bring a range of responses, both positive and negative. No one is under a false illusion to that effect.

When the member for Dovercourt questioned Mr David Cooke at the government agencies committee during his appearance for his appointment, I thought it odd and interesting from that perspective in his comments that Mr Cooke responded to the member for Dovercourt by saying:

"Some things that are being done here are close to what we were going to do. Even some of the decisions that the government has had to make, that it will be making, in terms of the new financing of school boards and how dollars will be distributed, those are things that

no matter who would have been elected, there would have had to be some decisions on."

I think that's a very important perspective that Mr Cooke brings to the debate, not only from his previous capacity as a senior minister in the former government, but as a co-chair of the Education Improvement Commission.

I find it somewhat difficult to be extremely critical of the member for Fort William or the member for Sudbury because, as I have sat in committee with those individuals, they have a unique blend of politics and passion for education in this province. But as we sat there and listened to the comments that the Liberal opposition members were making, I opened up the Liberal book and saw the very statements about school board reform, about education reform. It's important that we reflect on those comments and realize that the issue of education in this province is not isolated to the government of the day. It's an issue that has been addressed not only by a former Minister of Education but by a party that had clear intentions in the previous election of addressing education reform as well.

I thought of, as my colleague has alluded to, the comments that appeared in the Lindsay Daily Post. Those comments stated, "Ontario teachers have every right to protest provincial changes that they feel are going to damage education, but that opposition should stop at the classroom door." I fully endorse that position, and it's a position that, by and large, many constituents in my riding have made very clear to me in the conversations we've had.

By comparison to the member for Fort William, I think the classroom campaign as proposed by the secondary teacher executive is an insult to the many hardworking secondary teachers in Middlesex.

In conclusion, I would only emphasize that all efforts should be made to direct our efforts towards the classroom, avoid the politics and get on with the task of fundamentally reforming education in this province.

1100

The Acting Speaker: The Chair recognizes the member for Wentworth East.

Mr Doyle: I thank all my colleagues who spoke in support of my resolution here today.

To conclude, I would just like to say that nowhere in my resolution did I argue against political discussion in the classroom. I think it's extremely important that there is political discussion in the classroom. However, I'd like to point out that there is a great difference between political discussion and political indoctrination. This is the thing we are concerned about. I'm certainly concerned about that. Certainly nowhere did I intend to attack the teaching profession or public sector employees; that was not at all the truth. What I am trying to do is point out that politics have to be kept out of the classroom, though issues of the day in politics are certainly a topic for discussion by teachers.

I'd like to sincerely urge that all here today vote in favour of this resolution so that we may protect and defend the professionalism of teachers and maintain the integrity of the classroom.

As a conclusion to our debate, I'd like to end by reading portions of the preamble to my resolution that

sum up many significant points as to why we must pass this resolution.

Whereas the province of Ontario is responsible for the schooling of our children in the public school system; and

Whereas the Ministry of Education recognizes and respects the dedication and professionalism of teachers who have in their charge the education of our children so that they can attain the highest goals and pursue limitless opportunities; and

Whereas teachers are placed in sacred bond of trust between parents and their children to ensure their intellectual development is allowed to progress without interruption; and

Whereas school boards are required to ensure that all curriculum is based upon guidelines supplied by the Ministry of Education and Training; and

Whereas the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation has launched a campaign to bring its protest into the classrooms of Ontario in violation of that trust between teacher, parent, and student; and

Whereas the OSSTF is planning to use up valuable classroom time to pursue union politics and to exploit children in the classroom for its campaign —

The Acting Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Doyle: As I mentioned, Mr Speaker, in the opinion of this House, that should not be done.

As I mentioned, there are many challenges ahead, and I hope we can all move forward together to improve our education system that in the end will enable our children to face the new century with the confidence and knowledge they will need to prosper and succeed.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING RESTRUCTURATION DES HÔPITAUX

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): I move private member's notice of motion number 42:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should stop cutting base funding of hospitals and allow communities to determine how to restructure their hospital services and find efficiency savings based on their needs;

Should ensure that community services are in place before hospitals are closed since the Health Services Restructuring Commission has begun its work of amalgamating, merging and closing many hospitals across Ontario, in both urban and rural communities;

Should reinvest savings achieved through the restructuring process into local community services since the withdrawal of millions of dollars of hospital funding from those same communities is occurring without the commitment to reinvest those dollars into community services in that community;

Should ensure that hospital funding must be equitable and based on a formula that reflects demographic and regional needs; and

Should ensure that health services, including emergency and urgent care services, are available to all Ontarians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The member has 10 minutes.

Mrs Pupatello: Thank you, Speaker. I can tell you that I've waited for some time to have the opportunity to

bring forward a private member's resolution that would make a difference, not just for people in Windsor, Essex county, southwest Ontario, but indeed for all of Ontario.

My resolution today, as you've just heard, deals with health policy according to the Mike Harris government. All I can say, in particular to Conservative MPPs who are here in this House or who are in their offices at the moment and who I know will be coming into the House by noon to vote on what I view as probably one of the most important issues that we will face as legislators ever in our term here with the Harris government — I know they are listening because they are experiencing what we are in Windsor, in Essex county, where health services are concerned.

This began because the moment Mike Harris became the Premier, \$1.3 billion was being removed from hospitals. This is a \$1.3-billion cut over three years. What we looked for was reason in the policies of Mike Harris. We haven't been able to find reason. Repeatedly over the last several months we have brought our concerns into the House and we have been met with a wall. We have been met with a health minister who has not been prepared to listen to the real stories of people in Windsor, people from Atikokan hospital, people from Lakehead hospital, the people who are seeing the devastating effects of cuts to their base funding of hospitals with community services that are simply not in place.

We've heard many times the health minister on his feet here and the health minister has always said, "We are reinvesting more than we're cutting." So ladies and gentlemen, legislators in this House today, I have to ask you to listen sincerely to my colleagues who are advocating on behalf of this resolution. I have to ask you to listen sincerely to the stories you are hearing.

In the case of Windsor, we feel that our health services are suffering. We have report after report: "Bed Shortage Takes Toll." We have story after story. I have file folders like this in my office of letters from families who've had experiences in our hospital system or who have had experiences with the health services that simply have not been adequate. My office spends more time on one issue and that is health, and good quality health, than any other of the issues combined. We spend more of our time trying to ensure that the people in my riding of Windsor-Sandwich get good quality health care.

I know that all the MPPs in this House are striving to ensure that their residents have good quality care and what that means today is that while you can, during private members' hour, vote your conscience, not your party. This gives you the opportunity to stand up for the people in your constituencies, the people who have already written to you, the people who have sent you petitions. We know that's happened in Lanark-Renfrew; that's happened in London North; that's happened in Niagara. It's happened in Brampton South, Guelph, Niagara South, Rainy River.

There are Conservative MPPs in this House who have received petitions. Those petitions read almost verbatim what our private member's resolution is today, and that says that we are gravely concerned about the cuts to hospitals. We feel that health services are suffering. The government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting that money in those same communities.

We have current situations in Bruce, in Grey county. There are individuals there, their local representatives, who are in the House today. I will be watching with a close eye, as will your constituents, to see how you will be voting today, because we expect during private members' hour, when you have the one opportunity to vote, not with your party but with your conscience, you know what is the right thing to do.

1110

I will give you example after example that the reinvestment simply is not happening. Let's take the case of Windsor-Sandwich. We have an emergency ward which services the west side of Essex county. There are people here today from my riding who left Windsor at a quarter to six to be here today to watch how all of us as MPPs are responsible to see that emergency services will continue to be provided to the people all over Essex county, not just if you happen to live around Metropolitan's site or around Hotel Dieu, but that if you happen to be in LaSalle, Amherstburg, Anderdon or River Canard, you too will have access to emergency services.

That service is scheduled to close on April 18. What has not happened yet? Not a dollar has been flowing from this restructuring, amalgamating, merging that has allowed the other sites of emergency to be built up to take that overflow. That, friends, is a fact. I have brought the press to those emergency sites. They have seen it with their own eyes. This is something we cannot politicize. You have to know the fact and we expect you not be political today when you're voting on this resolution.

You are aware of the story of a Peterborough man who died in a hallway after spending hours overnight in emergency because there were no beds. Within days of our leader, Dalton McGuinty, bringing that message into this House, the health ministry announced that it would reinstate 15 beds in Peterborough, but they're short 20 to 30 beds on a regular basis.

What we are seeing is that there is no clear mission of the health minister. What we see is that there is no consistency to what he is doing. If we happen to bring the issue up in the House, suddenly we see something happen. We were supposed to have the report on restructuring from Lambton county today. Somehow that's been put on hold. Why? Because now the health minister wants to talk about a rural hospital policy. Why did they announce the closures in Pembroke if that was the case? We are finding example after example of no concrete plan. What I am asking members in this House today is to help us tell the health minister, your health minister, that what is happening is wrong, that people are suffering.

I want to mention too the numbers of people who have contacted me. These are people who are not necessarily from my riding but who knew that we would be debating this today. Naturally, we've let them know that we want their voices heard, so when we talk about the people from London North, the people from Niagara, the people who are truly concerned — we've been learning as we travel around Ontario that the Niagara region has the most senior population in Ontario. For them, when they watch what happens in health and in hospitals, they know that if they don't have problems today, they are going to have problems in 10 years.

All of the people who are being sent out on this charge, Duncan Sinclair included — the head of this hospital closing commission himself has said that he's been put up to this by the health minister. He himself is on record as saying that he will not be a party to the hospital closing commission if he doesn't see reinvestment happening in those communities because he knows it's the right thing to do.

Members, I ask you again most sincerely: The way that your health minister is sending through this health policy of making cuts to hospital funding at the same time as forcing amalgamating, merging, closures, is making them find savings in addition to the cuts. It is an impossible situation for hospital administrators to find ways to find the savings while they're being cut, while they're being merged and amalgamated. What happens is that people have only a couple of choices: They don't provide the service or they provide the service.

Unfortunately, what my files tell me, while we're being buried in paper in the offices across Ontario, is that our constituencies — I know they are, from story after story — are not getting the service. Friends, that is just not acceptable. It's not acceptable to me, to the people of Windsor-Sandwich, Grey county, Bruce county and Niagara Falls. These are the people who have been calling us and saying, "Help us change the health policies of this government." All I can say, friends, is please vote in favour of this today.

Interruption.

The Acting Speaker: Excuse me. Stop the clock. I would like to remind those who are visiting us today that there are absolutely no demonstrations in the galleries. We appreciate your being here. We'd like you to go by those rules.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): It's indeed appropriate that I stand today as a private member from London to talk about this resolution because of course yesterday the hospital restructuring commission came down with very devastating news for our community.

Let me preface my remarks by making it very clear that all of us in our party support restructuring our health care system. We want it to become a health care system instead of the illness system it is at the present time, and we want that to happen in an orderly fashion that does not endanger the patients who rely on the health system for their care — and that's all of us. This issue involves all of us and all of our families and all of our constituents.

Let me make it clear that I come from a community that has been working on restructuring extraordinarily hard and that was acknowledged in the commission's report yesterday as having moved ahead a lot further than other communities in terms of trying to cope with the new realities brought to us by technology, brought to us by changes in the delivery of health care in many different ways. That acknowledgement was very valuable. I was so proud as a representative of London to sit in the news conference with the various health care provider agencies yesterday and hear them clearly commit to work together on behalf of the patients in their areas and clearly say that although there were terrible problems in terms of human resource issues, they were prepared to try

and work together to ameliorate those problems as well as possible.

We're not talking about wholesale resistance to change in my community, but the most devastating aspect of this whole plan is the closure of two psychiatric hospitals in our area — not one, but two. Our community had worked very hard over a long period of time to try and recognize that, given the way in which new treatments for those who were psychiatrically disabled had allowed them to return to the community, it was unlikely two Ontario psychiatric hospitals within a 40-kilometre radius would be allowed to stay open. But to hear that both of those hospitals will be closed by December 31, 1999, throwing a minimum of 1,300 people out of work in the combined communities of Elgin and London-Middlesex, was a devastating piece of news.

Let me speak first about what it means for the patients who rely on those two hospitals. The commission made it very clear it was making this recommendation with the condition, and it's very clear, that it will only work if all \$46 million that is going to be saved as a result of the closure of those hospitals goes back into the community to provide services, and its expectation was that those services would be up and running and available to patients before those hospitals close.

There are a few logical difficulties here, because the major community service that assists those who are psychiatrically disabled, chronically psychiatrically ill, is homes for special care. What has this government done? They've downloaded homes for special care on to municipalities 100%. It is our estimate that if indeed this government goes ahead with what is now quite clear from the closure at Thunder Bay, the closure at Brockville and the closure at St Thomas and London, destroying the psychiatric hospital system entirely, we will need at least 2,000 units of housing across the province that is going to help these people to be as productive as possible, as healthy as possible and as safe as possible. Yet this same government, of course, has downloaded responsibilities for both social housing and homes for special care on to municipalities. This is a formula for disaster, quite frankly.

1120

It is possible to deinstitutionalize. In fact, our party has very clearly said we believe it is a more humane way to deal with chronic psychiatric illness — we've been very clear about that — but only if those supports are there in the community. Yet this government, at the same time it is closing this hospital, has taken other measures that make it almost impossible to ensure that those services will be available in communities at prices those communities can afford. Believe me, you cannot support an appropriate support system for the psychiatrically disabled on the property tax. It simply won't happen.

We have a situation, faced within a very small community of Elgin and London-Middlesex, where 300 beds of chronic care for psychiatric illnesses will be lost. We have no assurance of where those people will go and we have no assurance of how they will be cared for.

The second issue, of course, is the issue of who is going to look after them. In the whole process of deinstitutionalization which has been taking place over a

long period of time, the assumption was that we wouldn't lose the expertise of the people who have been working in those institutions, that we would retrain those people and help them to move into the community aspect of care. But we have a problem. If those beds are still open and the staff are still required to work in those facilities, how can they apply for and get retraining for the jobs in the community at the same time, particularly when the recommendation of the report is that nobody be discharged into the community until those services are up and running? There's a logical inconsistency here that's very difficult.

When we look at the economic impact — and I'm going to speak here for the member for Elgin, because he's an independent and doesn't have time under our rules at this time. The economic impact to a rural area of Elgin county of the closure of St Thomas Psychiatric Hospital is enormous, yet we have, with the influence of the Conservative members of this place, a minister announcing a halt in the closure to rural hospitals because of economic impact. It didn't make any difference in Elgin county, where the member doesn't happen to be a Progressive Conservative member. It is going to have a devastating affect on Elgin county, on its economic ability to maintain itself as a community, because of the heavy reliance there has been on that institution to provide jobs, to provide the spinoff for supply in that area.

The economic effect will not be quite as devastating within London, but we are a health care centre. Not only will the staff be unable to work at the psychiatric hospital, but this change in configuration, taking acute care away from St Joseph's Hospital and moving everything to the London Health Sciences Centre, will also have an enormous impact on jobs and an enormous impact on our community, on our ability to maintain our property tax status, on our ability to maintain our local businesses.

This is all happening at the same time that there are many other shoes left to drop. We do not know in our community, nor do others, what the final issue is going to be around the beds available in long-term care. When you close a psychiatric facility, when you change the configuration of services, when you deal with an issue of moving people out of acute care hospitals into some kind of convalescent phase, you automatically involve home care issues. Yet the decisions around home care, around long-term care, have yet to be made.

We are seeing all these changes accelerating faster and faster without all the pieces being put into place. What becomes very clear is that this government's health policy is not about restructuring health care. This government's policy is about cutting costs. This government's policy is about cutting costs without having done the impact studies, without understanding what the long-term and short-term and medium-term effects of their actions are going to be. The people who are going to suffer are those who are most vulnerable: the patients. That is the real problem we face.

We have a government that speaks one language when it comes to how much they care about the needs of patients in the health care system and then does something quite different. This minister and this ministry have

shown they are not managing this change well, that they have not been aware of the gaps that are forming and the problems that are forming. When we ask a question about cardiac care, the minister scrambles and says, "We'll flow some cash so those waiting lists will go down."

We shouldn't have to raise these issues in this place. This system, if it's restructuring, should be being managed well by the minister and the ministry, but it's not. Every single one of us, as members in this House, knows of the instances where this is the case. We all have examples in our offices and we all know that the mismanagement of this minister is a big part of the problem.

This minister says we're fearmongering. The fear is not coming from us; the fear is there in the patients and their families, who are experiencing the very real gap between the fine words of the minister and the reality they face when they go to their local hospitals.

We will be voting for this resolution and supporting very much the sense it brings to this Legislature, and we call upon the Tory members to do the same.

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I'm certainly pleased to join in the debate on this resolution brought by the member for Windsor-Sandwich, but I must confess that the resolution sounds very similar to the one put forward last week by the member for Renfrew North. I'm almost tempted to give the very same speech I did last week, but there's so much evidence in the resolutions of misinformation and conjecture that I really don't have to; there are other things to address.

I believe it was Mark Twain who once said that you should first get your facts straight, then you can distort them as you please. That is why this morning I'm going to discuss facts on the health care restructuring issues here in Ontario.

There is a certain irony to both these resolutions, because they are chastising the government for doing what the previous governments really failed to do. The previous governments recognized the desperate need for hospital restructuring in Ontario but they failed to tackle the problem.

That led to a situation where millions of dollars were wasted every year: millions wasted on administration, on maintenance and on overhead, millions just keeping up empty hospital wards closed by the previous government. In fact, the NDP government closed over 8,700 hospital beds in the province, and the closures of hospital beds really started with the government before that, the Liberals, who closed some 1,200 beds. That is over 10,000 beds closed by the previous two governments, equal to approximately 33 good-sized hospitals, yet all the bricks and mortar are still there, being paid for. What a colossal waste of our health care dollars, to continue paying for the administration, the maintenance and the heat and hydro when this money could have been better spent on front-line patient care.

That is the reason the hospital services restructuring commission was set up in January 1996. It has a mandate to improve the efficiencies of our hospital system, eliminate the waste and help us to put health care dollars back where they are needed the most, in caring for Ontario's sick and injured.

I would like to focus on a particular aspect of the member's resolution today, that is, the part about reinvesting the savings achieved through the restructuring process and reinvesting them back into community health care services.

Over the last year, we have already found some \$365 million in savings in our health care system by eliminating redundancy and waste, but at the same time we've reinvested some \$683 million in front-line community care services. That's almost double reinvestment of what's actually been saved.

That is because we as a government have a vision for health care: putting patients first. Getting the right care at the right time in the right place is what hospital restructuring is all about.

1130

Our vision incorporates these key issues of access and quality care, because that is what is important to the people of Ontario. They want a health care system that is there when they need it. Making sure it is there when they need it has taken many forms, particularly for rural Ontario. I am fortunate to represent a largely rural riding, Northumberland, and I know how important access to quality health care really is.

To date, we've reinvested some \$15 million in providing sessional fees to help recruit and retain physicians. We've done that to ensure that there's adequate emergency room services in small rural and northern communities, and nearly 90% of all eligible hospitals have used this program to support emergency services in rural Ontario.

We have also reinvested more than \$15 million in paramedic training to benefit northern and rural communities. This program has now been introduced to a number of base hospitals and will undoubtedly save lives that previously may have been lost. In the medical profession, that is what is referred to as outcome-based medicine, and it means doing what provides the best outcome for patients. Quite simply, all of the advanced medical technology and all of the new instrumentation available at the hospital is of no use if the patient dies before arriving at the hospital. This program will indeed ensure that more patients arrive alive.

But we are not stopping there. Along with that substantial reinvestment in the training of paramedics, we're also adding some 400 defibrillators to ambulance services across this province. We've put \$170 million into long-term care and community-based services for seniors, such as nursing care, personal care and physiotherapy. We've put some \$23.5 million into community-based mental health care services, and we've put \$14.7 million into the northern diabetes health network. We've put \$16.7 million into new immunization initiatives aimed at protecting seniors and children with communicable diseases. These are but a few of the examples of the reinvestment that we're making in community-based health care services.

A few minutes ago the member for London Centre commented on the two psychiatric hospitals being closed in London. She omitted to mention the new one that's being created in St Thomas, some 65 beds, and over-

looked the 50 extra beds we're creating in Windsor and some 47 extra beds that are being created in Waterloo.

I think it's important —

Interruption.

Mrs Boyd: That's not extra beds.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The member for London Centre.

I want to caution those in the gallery. There can be no noise from there. I realize you've come a long distance; it would be extremely counterproductive to have me clear the gallery. Please, there's no demonstration and no noise.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): But it's pretty hard to take.

The Speaker: Member for Cochrane South, I don't need your help. Thank you very much.

Mr Galt: I applaud the concern the member for Windsor-Sandwich has for providing appropriate and dependable health care services across Ontario, but in drafting her resolution she has failed to recognize the substantial reinvestment this government is making in health care services. There are few in the health care community that would say changes aren't needed. In fact, our dedicated health care providers have led the way to a more efficient system and, as we speak, they are making our health care system better all the time.

But they can't do it alone. They can't address the systemic problems of duplication, redundancy and waste. That takes leadership from the government of the day and, sadly, that leadership was not forthcoming under the two previous governments. That is a shame. But this government is setting out to put things right. We are taking the steps necessary and making reinvestments we need to improve Ontario's health care system and to make it the best health care system in the world. That's an attainable goal and this government is up to the challenge. That is why I cannot support this resolution today.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I'm pleased to rise on the resolution today to address five lines that contain more vision on health care than we've heard from this government in its whole term in office. The whole idea that before indiscriminate cutting of hospital services there would be a plan in place, the services to replace the cuts would be in place before you cut the hospitals, is elementary logic to everyone except the members opposite.

We hear from the members opposite a lot of ministry baffle-gab, but the people in their ridings know. They know in Northumberland that the hospital in Cobourg has been cut and they know that cut of \$1.1 million means less services. No amount of rhetoric in this House is going to provide those services to those people in those emergency wards. There are fewer nurses, there are fewer procedures taking place, there is less care in health care thanks to the Harris Tories.

The same thing happens in Orillia. The member for Simcoe East will surely be aware that \$3.2 million has been cut from that single hospital in his riding; 10% taken away not by a previous government — these are Harris hospital cuts.

Similarly in Bruce, in Owen Sound, \$7.4 million lost irresponsibly, a 15% cut enacted by this government that doesn't have the courage to admit when it's making mistakes. It doesn't have the courage to listen to its own experts.

We revealed this week, for the benefit of the audience out there, a confidential document which shows that the Minister of Health, a year and a half after making \$1.3 billion in cuts, had a study group trying to come up with ways to make them. This study group of the best experts he could find came back to him and said, "These cuts can't be done." All the members opposite may or may not be aware that that group said even last year, even this year that's unfolding right now, "Hurt has happened." The ministry's own model said that \$130 million of the \$365 million in cuts is coming, and there's no way to put this delicately, "out of the hides of patients." You can't do it with clinical efficiencies, you can't do it with administrative efficiencies, you're doing it by hurting patients.

In the seats over there members are sitting, members who are supposed to represent their ridings, the health care and the health and wellbeing of the people who live in their ridings.

We know the member for Lincoln must be aware of the \$844,000 cut in Grimsby, an 8% reduction.

The cuts are taking place in Kitchener, where I had the honour to talk to the people from St Mary's who are trying to hold on to their hospital, but that hospital has been cut by 11%, by \$4.3 million, and people do not have the replacement.

As we look at what's happening next week here in Metro, we know places like Queensway are going to be faced with the same irresponsible, unplanned cuts. They're looking, as we're looking, for the members opposite to admit their mistakes and to stand behind a resolution like the one we have today.

1140

M. Bisson: Je prends cette occasion pour parler directement à la motion que le député de Windsor amène à l'Assemblée aujourd'hui. C'est vraiment à propos que aujourd'hui, on a ces discussions, parce que justement lundi de cette semaine, la commission de restructuration des hôpitaux à Ottawa est venue avec ses recommandations faisant affaire avec la fermeture des hôpitaux à Ottawa. Et contenu dans toute cette paperasse qu'ils nous ont amenée se trouve la décision de fermer l'hôpital Montfort dans la communauté d'Ottawa. Je veux dire à travers ce débat, dans les minutes que j'ai, que le gouvernement a besoin de vraiment reconsidérer la décision qu'ils vont faire à travers ces recommandations.

Il faut comprendre quelque chose. Le gouvernement essaie de nous faire croire que cette commission est complètement séparée du gouvernement et que le Cabinet, eux, ne savent pas ce qui se passe à l'intérieur de la commission. Moi, je ne crois pas pour une seconde que le gouvernement conservateur n'a pas su avant que la déclaration ait été faite à Ottawa que l'hôpital Montfort et les autres hôpitaux seraient fermés. Ce qui m'inquiète dans toute cette question, c'est comment un gouvernement conservateur dit, une journée, «Nous, les conservateurs, croient non seulement aux services en français dans

la province, mais on va promouvoir ces services et on va les améliorer», et, dans l'autre instance, ferment un des seuls hôpitaux francophones dans la province. Ce n'est pas acceptable.

Le gouvernement a besoin de comprendre que l'hôpital Montfort ne dessert pas seulement la communauté francophone d'Ottawa, mais qu'il est très important pour la communauté francophone à travers tout l'Ontario. Par exemple, je veux vous dire, et je dis au ministre de la Santé, au premier ministre et, spécialement, au ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, qui est tombé endormi dans cette mission, que l'hôpital Montfort dessert toute la province dans beaucoup de manières.

Premièrement, il y a un partenariat entre l'hôpital Montfort et l'Université d'Ottawa quand ça vient à l'entraînement des médecins partout dans la province de l'Ontario. Dans le comté du député de Cochrane-Nord, de mon collègue M. Wood, dans mon comté à Cochrane-Sud, à Nickel Belt, à Timiskaming, à Windsor et autres communautés en Ontario, on a besoin de médecins francophones pour desservir notre population, parce qu'il y a beaucoup d'entre nous qui ne parlent pas l'anglais et qui ne peuvent pas aller chercher les services en anglais.

Où est-ce qu'on entraîne ces médecins-là ? C'est à travers l'Université d'Ottawa, le seul programme dans lequel on entraîne des médecins francophones dans la province, et où font-ils leur stage ? À l'hôpital Montfort.

Le gouvernement doit comprendre que l'hôpital Montfort n'est pas seulement un hôpital qui dessert la communauté d'Ottawa ; il dessert toute la communauté de l'Ontario dans des endroits très importants.

Une autre affaire que le gouvernement a besoin de comprendre, c'est que, quand quelqu'un est malade dans le comté de M. Wood ou dans le comté de moi, M. Bisson, et qu'il a besoin de traitements d'un spécialiste médical, et qu'il a besoin de ces services en français, souvent ces services ne sont pas disponibles dans notre coin par les médecins francophones, particulièrement les spécialistes. Encore, on fait beaucoup de références à l'hôpital Montfort, à travers la province, pour ceux qui ont besoin de services en français quand ça vient à l'accès aux médecins spécialistes.

Je veux dire, dans les secondes qui me restent, que vous aurez une opportunité, dans les 25 jours prochains, à faire une décision, le Cabinet de l'Ontario, ou d'influencer une recommandation à la commission de restructuration des hôpitaux d'Ottawa, de renverser cette décision et de réétudier comment on peut mieux desservir la communauté francophone, et que cela n'inclue pas la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort, et le gouvernement a besoin de renverser sa décision.

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I always like Thursday mornings when you can get an opportunity to get up and speak on issues that are very important to the people of this province. This resolution today is one of those:

"That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should stop cutting base funding of hospitals and allow communities to determine how to structure their hospital services and find efficiency savings based on their needs;

"Should ensure that community services are in place before hospitals are closed, since the Health Services Restructuring Commission has begun its work of amalgamating, merging and closing many hospitals across Ontario, in both urban and rural communities;

"Should invest savings achieved through the restructuring process in the community services since the withdrawal of millions of dollars of hospital funding from these same communities is occurring without the commitment to reinvest these dollars into community services in that community;

"Should ensure that hospital funding must be equitable and based on a formula that reflects demographic and regional needs; and

"Should ensure that health services, including emergency and urgent care services, are available to all Ontarians."

The resolution is well put together, and first I would like to thank the member for Windsor-Sandwich for the careful and thoughtful planning that went into this resolution. She's obviously capitalizing on the fears of those in the community who have not yet grasped the whole picture of how this government is reshaping hospital services to best suit the needs of individual communities.

Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North): Ask Bill Murdoch about the fear and worry in his riding.

Mr McLean: The changes are being made. The government is shifting dollars from the hospital sector to community-based care. It is the word "change" that creates uncertainty. It is the word "change" that allows fears to be used as a tool when it's applied to something as important as health care.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Member for Cochrane North, I'm warning you to come to order. Members for Cochrane South, Windsor-Sandwich and Hamilton East, I want to give you fair notice that I've warned you to maintain control and stop heckling the member. Member for Simcoe East.

Mr McLean: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This province can no longer afford the present system of health care. New technologies make our outdated ideas of health care standards obsolete. Procedures which once required several days in hospital can now be completed in day surgery. For some time now, hospitals have not needed the same number of patient rooms that were needed 15 years ago. Technology has allowed departments to be established which can be shared by several hospitals or communities, and the Ontario Hospital Association has stated publicly they share the government's quest to make Ontario hospitals more efficient.

The vision we all have for health care in the province is putting patients first. Restructuring will create better management, more coordination and effective hospitals. In many areas, the communities are already involved in making the changes. Hospital boards have been amalgamated and hospitals themselves have shifted their services. For example, in my riding the district health council and the boards of directors of the Huronia District Hospital in Midland and the Penetanguishene General

Hospital have successfully shifted the focus and restructured their services to better care for their communities.

This community recognized the need to restructure in 1992 and began plotting a new course at that time. The decision to form the North Simcoe Hospital Alliance was defined as follows: "The purpose of the North Simcoe Hospital Alliance is to develop a mechanism by which the two institutions will be able to plan to maximize the use of existing and new health care resources available to the area and to provide the best quality of hospital care to the residents of north Simcoe."

The news release at the time indicated the two hospitals will see health programs concentrated on long-term care and rehabilitation, together with primary care and outpatient clinics. One hospital has mainly chronic care, the other has acute care; one administration. That's what's going to happen across Ontario. Some amalgamations will take place and therefore we'll save a large amount of dollars.

The government has a fundamental commitment not to let the health care funding fall below \$17.4 billion. In actual fact it is currently \$17.7 billion. For the member for York South to indicate that \$3.2 million — over how many years was he talking about the \$3.2 million that was being taken out of the funding going to the Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital? I want to see that hospital maintained in its capacity to serve the community at large.

We have also what we call the community care service centres that are being established. We have one now that is proposed for Simcoe county. We now have people appointed to that board. We have Bob Morton, the past administrator of the home for the aged in Midland, who is now the CEO of this new community care centre. Bob, with his past experience, is an excellent choice, and I'm sure he will work with the district health councils.

When the member talks in her resolution with regard to communities to determine how restructuring the hospitals takes place, is that going to be with the community care people? Is it going to be with the district health council? We want to see that happen. We want to see the people in the community involved, and we want to see the hospitals maintained.

As far as I'm concerned, in rural and small town Ontario there will be some amalgamations. I do not anticipate that the hospitals will be closed down. There may be some, but very, very few. They will be used for chronic care and they will be used for acute care. Overall, I think the plan that these community care access centres have will work.

We have people in the county of Simcoe from Perkinsfield, Tottenham, Barrie, Elmvale, Penetanguishene, Orillia, Beeton. These people are all appointed to that community care centre. These are the people I hope she's referring to in her resolution who will have input into the community, through these people. That will make the hospital work more efficiently and it will help the government to be able to direct where they feel is the most important area for their costs to go to.

When we have the district health council in Grey-Bruce determining that hospitals should close, I think that's wrong. I think it's the commission's job. They

were established to do it, and I'm sure that when the time comes —

The Speaker: I thank the member. Further debate?
1150

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-Walkerville): I want to begin by congratulating my colleague from Windsor-Sandwich, who, as always, is representing the interests of her constituents in a strong and forthright manner.

I want to address the government on the whole question of hospitals and health care. You are cutting health care. You are cutting hospitals and you are not putting in place services to replace them. You are doing a disservice not only to this province but to your constituents by not recognizing the fact that there are not proper community-based services in place and that our hospital resources are taxed well beyond any reasonable limit as it is.

Thousands of nurses will lose their jobs. Thousands of health care workers will lose their jobs. Hospitals will close indeed, but there will not be new services put in place to help deal with the fallout.

Let's take Windsor, for example. You have cut the Sandwich Community Health Centre at the same time you're eliminating emergency service in the west end of Windsor. That is an absolute shame. Your original proposal, the document that our community agreed to — and I say to the Tory members who are looking at reconfiguration in their communities, when the minister and the government tells you they will invest, don't believe them. Our document said "two centres of excellence." We're left with two hospitals that are barely able to cope and no emergency services in the west end of the city of Windsor. Our document said we'd get an MRI machine before any of this happens; we don't have it in place yet, although the functional plan is moving on. Our document talked about better use of resources, but it certainly didn't contemplate long-term-care dollars being downloaded to municipalities and on to the property tax base.

To the members of the government, I say this: Stand up for your constituents today; stand up for a universal, accessible, affordable health care system. You voted down previous private members' bills to protect Ontario's interests in the Canada Health Act, to continue to have the kind of health care we deserve.

That's not to say the system is perfect, but it is to say it's better than the alternative, and it is to say that your alternative is indeed no alternative; it's an alternative that eliminates services and leaves people dangerously exposed, people like my constituent who has had to hire a private nurse at night because her son, who was injured in a car accident — they can't trust the hospital. They're afraid to leave him alone at night because they can't get a nurse.

The members opposite will find this out: They're not restructuring health care; they're cutting money out of the system for your tax cut. The people in your ridings will realize that when they go into emergency rooms. They will realize that when they try to access health care throughout.

I applaud my colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich. I'm proud to stand with her. I'm proud to vote against you. The people in my community and the people across this province know what your agenda is. Your

agenda is to undermine publicly affordable, accessible health care. You ought to be ashamed and you ought to start dealing with the real issues.

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): I want to congratulate my colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich for this excellent resolution. If you read what the resolution says carefully, it really outlines what you promised to do in the Common Sense Revolution; it really outlines what you promised to do from day one. It talks about ensuring that there's a plan in place for reinvestment of those dollars you take out of hospital care into community based care. The reality is, though, it has not happened. What we have seen has been cut after cut across this province. We have seen the steamrolling, appointed, lackey commission of this government go across Ontario and blindly close hospitals without giving a damn about people, without caring how it affects people's lives. That's all we have seen to date.

In two years \$57 million has been cut out of hospital care in my own community, in Hamilton-Wentworth. Two weeks ago, \$8.5 million was cut out of community care, out of seniors' residences, Macassa Lodge. Where are the reinvestments? I challenge members of this government to show me where the \$64 million or \$65 million reinvestment in Hamilton-Wentworth has been. It is a fraud; it is a hoax.

This government is continuing day after day to create a crisis in health care. They're doing it simply to satisfy one goal, and that is that promise of the 30% tax cut to their rich friends. You have a greater concern in delivering that tax cut to your corporate friends than you do in quality health care across this province.

People across the floor have spoken and said how well this is working. We saw examples the other day where people have died in hospital waiting rooms. People have died in emergency waiting rooms because there was no one there to take care of them. I had a constituent who died two hours after she was released from an emergency room because they were overcrowded and she could not be looked after. She was sent home and died of a heart attack. That is the reality of Mike Harris's Ontario; that is the reality of your health care cuts.

You can run around, you can try to fool people, you can spend millions and millions on television ads, you can put Mike Harris in hockey arenas, tell us how wonderful the province is, but you're going to pay one hell of a price for your health care cuts. People in Ontario may forgive you for cutting welfare benefits, although it is wrong. People in Ontario may forgive you for gutting their education system, although it is wrong. But I can tell you that people in Ontario are not going to forgive and forget what you have done to the health care system.

I would ask the Tory members, don't vote the Tory line. Forget the hacks and the whips in the Premier's office. Vote your conscience. Vote your constituents on this resolution. Think of the people in your riding who need hospital care. Think of the senior citizens. Think of someone who has a child at 3 o'clock in the morning and needs an emergency room to take that child to because the child is sick. Think of those folks when you vote on this resolution.

I can tell you, come the next election, in your own riding you're going to have to defend this. When you knock on a door and you explain to someone why they went to an emergency room at 3 o'clock in the morning with their child and it was closed, Mike Harris is not going to be there to prop you up. The hacks and flunkies in the Premier's office are not going to be there to give you the speaking notes. You're going to have to look those folks straight in the eye and tell them why you have done this to the health care system.

Your cuts to health care are going to bring you down. Your cuts to health care are going to destroy your government. Your cuts to health care are going to be the end of the Comic Book Revolution come the next election.

Interruption.

The Speaker: I just want to say to those in the gallery that you're welcome here but you can't clap, you can't speak, you can't make any demonstrations. If you do, the guard will come down to escort you out. I'd appreciate it, and I'm sure you would, if you didn't participate in that fashion and there will be no trouble. Thank you.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): Only we are allowed to make noise.

The Speaker: Yes, that's absolutely true.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I want to first of all commend the member for Windsor-Sandwich for bringing forward this very timely resolution, and for once again placing before the Legislative Assembly the important issue of hospital closings and the deterioration of health care in this province.

In the Niagara region we have been confronted with a cut of some \$44 million still to come in our hospital funding. We've already had substantial cuts in hospital funding which have caused hospitals to lay off nurses and other individuals who work in those hospitals and who play a very significant role. This is simply unacceptable.

If you talk to the people of this province, they will tell you that their highest priority is health care in this province. I think that crosses gender, that crosses economic background, that crosses social background. This is exceedingly important to the people of this province.

We have under the gun at the present time the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital in Grimsby, which is providing an excellent service to the people in that area. We have the Port Colborne General Hospital, the Douglas Memorial Hospital in Fort Erie, the Niagara-on-the-Lake General Hospital and the Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines, all under the gun.

Now, the local restructuring commission — or as I call it "hospital closing commission" — in our area has been dealt a card which says that they must take into account a \$44-million cut still to come in hospital funding. What we need in Niagara instead is a \$25-million increase in funding, because if you compare us to other parts of the province we are underfunded.

People who go to hospitals today know they cannot get the same level of service they used to get. Not because the hospital staff is not dedicated, they're extremely dedicated, but they're totally overworked. Hospitals aren't as clean as they used to be. The kind of service that is provided is now only available if one has a friend or a

family member there. So we've seen that deterioration of service.

We in the Niagara region have an older-than-average population, and as people become more elderly they naturally require more acute care and chronic care in our hospitals. What the province should be doing is adding on to the services that are available in the Niagara region and in other parts of the province, not subtracting from that.

I well recall on May 18, 1995, that Robert Fisher of Global TV, on a panel during the leaders' debate during the election, asked the then leader of the Conservative Party, Mike Harris if he planned to close hospitals. His answer was, "Certainly I can guarantee you, Robert, it is not my plan to close hospitals." Well, there are people all over this province who know now that the Premier is not keeping that promise.

I hear the government members say, from time to time, that they keep all their promises: "One thing you can say about the Conservatives is they kept their promises." This is one of the long list of promises to the people of this province that have been broken. I think you're going to find out, as you go from community to community closing hospitals, no matter where they happen to be, that people are going to be revolting against this, as you cut health care so you can feed that silly tax scheme you have that is going to provide the richest and most privileged people in our society with huge amounts of money back from that tax cut, while you allow our services in this province, and most acutely health care services, to deteriorate significantly. I think that's totally unacceptable and the people of this province are beginning to tell that to you.

I now see some signs that the Minister of Health may be in retreat. That is mildly encouraging, but what we have to see is a complete rethinking of these closings on the part of the government. The people in Port Colborne, Fort Erie, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Grimsby, St Catharines, and over the Niagara region, will simply not accept the Premier breaking his solemn promise not to close hospitals.

We want our hospitals, we want good health care in the Niagara region and the rest of the province. It's up to this government to do so and I'm glad the member for Windsor-Sandwich had the intestinal fortitude to bring this forward. I hope the government supports it.

Mrs Pupatello: First, I want to thank the people who decided to come down today to Queen's Park to watch, to listen to what we have to say about health care in Ontario. There are people here from Grimsby, from Kitchener, from Queensway hospital, Bill and Ruth, who have been long-time advocates of Queensway. I want to thank the people who got up at 4 o'clock this morning to get on a bus at the Caboto Club at 5:30 in the morning to drive up the 401 so they could come here and listen and wonder which one of us is telling the truth. How many people here honestly believe that all these stories, all the services we are not getting, are not true? That's what I want to know.

Why do I get letters from the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary wishing they could be here

today and advocating, thankfully moving it to a level I have yet to reach because they are praying for us too?

Members, today is the time you do not have to be political and support your political party. Today is the day you can support a resolution that will guarantee good-quality health care in Ontario.

Let me remind the members of this House that the ridings which have representatives from Sarnia, Simcoe East, Bill Murdoch, Halton North, Rainy River, Niagara South, Guelph, Brampton North, Niagara, London North, all of these ridings have submitted petitions to their MPPs to be read in this House in support of this resolution.

Today is the day you have to do that for your residents at home, because we will continue to fight, whether it's today or whether it's tomorrow. We deserve good-quality health care and we are going to get it.

The Speaker: I know all the ridings, but I don't know the one named "Bill Murdoch."

TEACHERS' PROTESTS

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Private member's notice of motion number 41, standing in the name of Mr Doyle: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Private member's notice of motion number 42, standing in the name of Mrs Pupatello: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. It's a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1205 to 1210.

TEACHERS' PROTEST

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): All those in favour of private member's notice of motion number 41, please rise and remain standing to be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Baird, John R.	Grimmett, Bill	Parker, John L.
Bassett, Isabel	Guzzo, Garry J.	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Beaubien, Marcel	Hastings, John	Ross, Lillian
Carroll, Jack	Johnson, Bert	Sheehan, Frank
Chudleigh, Ted	Jordan, W. Leo	Skarica, Toni
Danford, Harry	Kells, Morley	Smith, Bruce
Doyle, Ed	Leadston, Gary L.	Spina, Joseph
Elliott, Brenda	Martiniuk, Gerry	Sterling, Norman W.
Fisher, Barbara	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Ford, Douglas B.	McLean, Allan K.	Vankoughnet, Bill
Fox, Gary	Munro, Julia	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Froese, Tom	Murdoch, Bill	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Newman, Dan	
Gilchrist, Steve	O'Toole, John	

The Speaker: All those opposed, please rise and remain standing to be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Gerretsen, John	Miclash, Frank
Bartolucci, Rick	Grandmaître, Bernard	Morin, Gilles
Bisson, Gilles	Kennedy, Gerard	Patten, Richard
Boyd, Marion	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Castrilli, Annamarie	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Silipo, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Lankin, Frances	Wildman, Bud
Cordiano, Joseph	Martel, Shelley	Wood, Len
Crozier, Bruce	Martin, Tony	
Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 40; the nays are 28.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): All those in favour of private member's notice of motion number 42, please rise and remain standing and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Kennedy, Gerard	Morin, Gilles E.
Bartolucci, Rick	Kormos, Peter	Murdoch, Bill
Bisson, Gilles	Kwinter, Monte	Patten, Richard
Boyd, Marion	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Lankin, Frances	Sergio, Mario
Castrilli, Annamarie	Leadston, Gary L.	Silipo, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Martel, Shelley	Vankoughnet, Bill
Cordiano, Joseph	Martin, Tony	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Crozier, Bruce	Martiniuk, Gerry	Wildman, Bud
Duncan, Dwight	McLean, Allan K.	Wood, Len
Gerretsen, John	McLeod, Lyn	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Miclash, Frank	

The Speaker: Those opposed, please rise and remain standing to be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Baird, John R.	Galt, Doug	Parker, John L.
Bassett, Isabel	Gilchrist, Steve	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Beaubien, Marcel	Grimmett, Bill	Ross, Lillian
Carroll, Jack	Guzzo, Garry J.	Sheehan, Frank
Chudleigh, Ted	Hastings, John	Skarica, Toni
Danford, Harry	Johnson, Bert	Smith, Bruce
Doyle, Ed	Jordan, W. Leo	Spina, Joseph
Elliott, Brenda	Kells, Morley	Sterling, Norman W.
Fisher, Barbara	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Ford, Douglas B.	Munro, Julia	Wood, Bob
Fox, Gary	Newman, Dan	
Froese, Tom	O'Toole, John	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 34; the nays are 34.

The Speaker: The ayes are 34; the nays are 34. I have to vote and I will vote in favour of the resolution.

This House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock.

The House recessed from 1216 to 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH CARE IN SUDBURY

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): The Minister of Health must let the people of Sudbury and northeastern Ontario know what his reinvestment plan is for our community.

There are currently over 227 heart patients waiting for surgery in northern Ontario. The equipment and the world-class staff already exist at the Sudbury Memorial Hospital, which you plan to close. I recommended to you last October that this site would be an excellent world-class heart and thoracic institute. You have a responsibility to the heart patients.

Will you ensure that you commit funding to Sudbury's YMCA Centre for Life, a community project that promotes prevention as a way of curbing costs? When will you make that announcement?

I encouraged you last October as well. You also have a responsibility to the cancer patients of northern Ontario. Will you commit funding to the northern Ontario community cancer care program? You have been aware of this program for a year and a half.

Finally, as I've said in the House before and I will continue to say, the system you are recommending for Sudbury is too small. It doesn't have enough beds. It doesn't have enough reinvestment dollars. We want to know how many dollars you are going to reinvest in Sudbury. We want to know when you are going to fund these projects that the Liberals have been telling you to fund for a year and a half now. Act now.

ST PETER'S HOSPITAL

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): Last week I rose and asked the Minister of Health about the plight of St Peter's chronic care hospital in my riding. There's a hospital that has a south wing that has deplorable conditions, a 70-year-old wing with 80 beds. Our government, the NDP government, had approved the replacement of those 80 beds. This government had agreed with that plan, allowed the first phase to take place, which was the excavation of the land, and indeed paid 50% of the cost of that. Now, on January 28, the hospital was informed that they have to stop all construction, halt immediately and wait for the commission.

In addition to putting the patients in jeopardy, given the condition of this building and the fact that it doesn't meet any building code or fire code standards as they now exist, the fire department allowed things to continue knowing that the funding was going to flow to build that new wing. Then, when they stopped it, we not only have the worry of the patients and the staff in this unsafe building but there's now a 20-foot hole in the ground the size of a football field that is jeopardizing the neighbourhood children.

Our community and St Peter's Hospital cannot wait until the commission finishes its work. That could take months, it could take a year. You're putting too many patients at risk, too many of the staff at risk and too many of the children. I say to the minister, if somebody gets hurt in that hole that you've allowed to be dug in the ground, are you going to take responsibility?

DEVELOPMENT IN COBOURG

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I rise to recognize the fine efforts of the Cobourg Economic Development Commission. The economic development office works to foster growth, prosperity and employment opportunities for the people of Cobourg. As a result of their hard work and dedication, I'm able to share the following successes with the House today.

I'm honoured to report that the latest employment statistics issued show that the town of Cobourg has regained all of the over 900 manufacturing jobs that were lost in 1991-92 because of the recession. This is a huge accomplishment which indicates that they are set on the path to prosperity.

Congratulations to the town of Cobourg for its recent successes at the Ontario Marketing Awards competition held by the Economic Developers Council of Ontario. As another indication of its efforts, Cobourg received five awards for excellence in the economic development marketing material division.

Cindy Symons-Milroy, director of the Cobourg Economic Development Commission, in its recent press release, stated, "This town has a lot to offer prospective employers, including a first-class workforce, superb quality of life and a host of recreational and cultural amenities." I cannot agree more with Ms Symons-Milroy, and I encourage all members present today to visit this community and see first hand the successes it has achieved.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): My statement today is directed to the Premier. This past Monday more than 150 residents attended a town hall meeting in Dryden. The meeting was called to discuss the unprecedented downloading your government has imposed upon local taxpayers throughout the province. To say the least, local residents in Dryden and throughout northwestern Ontario are concerned and disturbed with what they are witnessing from this government.

Dryden residents were told by the town treasurer that the Harris dumping of provincial responsibility will result in a 75% increase in residential taxes. We also heard from the director of the local hospital, who told the gathering that if he is forced to make any more cuts to his budget, his hospital could potentially become a first aid station.

This government promised during the last election that if elected, "We will work closely with municipalities to ensure that any actions taken will not result in increases to local property taxes." Now that municipalities and hospitals throughout the province have demonstrated that they are unable to handle your dumping policy and your cuts, you have decided to ignore their cries for help.

Premier, you also stated in the revolutionary document that you would "sit down with municipalities to discuss ways of reducing government entanglement." You also stated that you wanted to stop "unfair downloading." You have not done any of these things and the people of northwestern Ontario deserve better.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): Chief Justice McMurtry and Chief Justice LeSage have been consistent in warning this government that a shortage of funds is backlogging both the civil and criminal justice systems. We see Askov rearing its ugly head again as serious charges are thrown out of court as a result of lengthy delays that are a result of this government's mismanagement of our courts and this Attorney General's very specific mismanagement of his ministry.

How does the Ministry of the Attorney General respond to these comments by two esteemed jurists in this province? I'll tell you what the ministry said about them: "All they have to do is burp, fart or belch and it's on the front page. I think they believe they are trying to help, but they're not." What does the Ministry of the Attorney General have to say about these two esteemed jurists? "I have three words for what the chief justices are doing: out of touch."

That's simply not the case. Charlie Harnick, the Attorney General, is out of touch. He mismanaged the family support plan and left thousands of women and their children penniless while he bungled and fumbled what had been operative and working until he shut down eight regional offices and dismissed almost 300 staff people.

He's mismanaged our court systems, inviting more and more serious charges to be tossed out because he as Attorney General has displayed nothing but incompetence, and now he displays disdain for the messengers. I suppose it's a good thing that justices McMurtry and LeSage are judges, otherwise —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much, Member.

1340

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I rise in the House today in what has been a historic week in the province of Ontario. The government-appointed Health Services Restructuring Commission has announced a bold new plan for hospitals in three cities. We're now finally seeing some real change in the way health services are delivered rather than simply talking about it, as previous governments did.

Ontario spends more per person on health care than almost any other jurisdiction in the world. That money has not always been spent wisely. Hospitals must be, and are, at the forefront of the changes currently being made. Between 1989 and 1995, 8,700 acute care beds were closed without a single building being shut down. We continue to support the administration and overhead costs of these vacated areas.

With this week's announcements, we're embarking on the final road towards a more efficient system, putting patients first. We're embarking on a system to reinvest savings back into the health care the community needs.

Change is difficult to accept. The district health councils and community care agency committees have to work together to make some recommendations to the restructuring committee to make these changes take place.

We all know we need more health care in the communities. We need more nursing homes. We need more homes for the aged.

Reinvestment has taken place in several medical areas, such as the Ontario breast screening program, kidney dialysis and cancer treatment. These are necessary decisions. Restructuring is necessary. We've got to make the tough choices for Ontarians.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): Here's a quick quiz for the members of the House. Who said, "What really disturbs me is the fact that there has been literally no consultation. We've been excluded from the whole battle, and that raises some serious questions about the credibility of the results," and what was that person referring to?

You'd be correct if you answered the Honourable Bob Runciman, Solicitor General, commenting on the government's process used to close the Brockville Psychiatric Centre. You see, even members of Mike Harris's own cabinet admit that the process, the approach being used to restructure the province's hospital sector, is seriously and fatally flawed.

We saw more evidence of that this morning when members of the government voted in support of the member for Windsor-Sandwich's private member's resolution urging the government to reconsider what it is doing in the hospital sector.

Ontarians have lost confidence in the restructuring process and in this government. They fear the lack of local consultation. They grow ever more worried as evidence comes in that hospitals are being closed before community-based services are in place and that it's hurting patients. Daily we're hearing horror stories of sick people in hospitals being neglected because nurses have been laid off due to the budget cuts.

During the 1995 election debate, Mike Harris told voters: "I guarantee that it's not my plan to close hospitals. I don't see services being diminished." Those words have come back to haunt the Premier.

We in the Liberal Party think the government is being reckless and is hurting the people of Ontario on a daily basis. This is not good-quality —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.

CHARITABLE GAMING

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): You will know that the government last week made an announcement about charitable casinos. When you think of a charitable casino, you might think of those neighbourhood Monte Carlo nights that take place for a night or two in your local banquet hall, a few card games and a roulette wheel. Let me tell you, that's not what this government is talking about. They are talking about permanent casinos that can be open up to seven days a week, 24 hours a day, with 40 gaming tables and 150 video slot machines. These are not replacing those neighbourhood Monte Carlo nights.

Let me tell you that in the election this government promised a referendum for communities before they would put a casino in. They've now said that promise doesn't apply to these casinos. The Premier has even

gone so far as to say he doesn't care if municipalities have voted no or put zoning bylaws in to prohibit them; he's going to force them in. In his announcement he even said what communities they were going to put them in.

One of those communities is the Beaches in Toronto, the community I represent, a community in which the people, the citizens, have been very clear, for two to three years now in planning discussions over Greenwood lands, that we want nothing to do with a casino in the Beaches in Toronto.

You'd better listen, Mr Premier. You'd better put a process in place that respects the wishes of citizens. The wish of Beaches-Woodbine residents is that we want no casino.

RAOUL WALLENBERG

Ms Isabel Bassett (St Andrew-St Patrick): Yesterday in London, England, Queen Elizabeth II unveiled a statue in honour of a great hero of the Holocaust, Raoul Wallenberg. A Swedish diplomat stationed in Hungary during the Second World War, Mr Wallenberg used every resource at his disposal to save the lives of over 100,000 Jews in Nazi-occupied Hungary. He placed people in safe houses flying the neutral Swedish flag. He produced phoney passports and even personally snatched Jews already on their way to death camps.

Yvonne Singer, a Canadian now living in Toronto, was born in Hungary during the war, in Raoul Wallenberg's office. Mr Wallenberg then became her godfather. Yvonne Singer has worked together with many others to secure information about what happened to Mr Wallenberg after he was arrested and interned by the invading Soviets in 1945.

The unveiling ceremony is also intended as a united voice from around the world, which includes that of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who is married to Wallenberg's niece, and that of the government of Israel, to ask Russia once again to bring closure to the case of one of the great heroes of the 20th century.

On behalf of all members, I too join in this special tribute to Canada's only honorary citizen, Raoul Wallenberg.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. You've been asked to listen to the people of Metro when they vote on megacity, but you said you wouldn't. Why? Because the question wasn't scientific. Your precise answer was that it wasn't the kind of question that Angus Reid or Environics would ask.

Well, Environics did ask a real question, a scientific question, and they didn't ask any dead people or dogs, just real people. Here's what they found: The people of Metro don't want your megacity. Even your own cabinet colleagues the Attorney General and the chief government whip are having second thoughts. They're trying to soften

their positions by suggesting that local councils will stay intact, that there won't be any real difference.

Your own secret polls are showing you that the plans for a megacity are going to be in big trouble come Monday. Will you admit once and for all —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, member for Lawrence.

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): When people are dealing only with the issue of amalgamation, the support for a single city is very strong. What is happening is that there are small percentages of the population who are concerned about other issues who have decided to park a vote in the referendum process to show their concerns about other issues. When you put all those groups together, it'll probably be a sizeable No vote. But my view is that if they were asked to vote on each of those issues individually, there would be strong support for every one of them.

Mr Cordiano: At the end of the day, the people are saying and suggesting to you through public hearings and meetings all over the place around Metro that they don't want a megacity. You won't listen to the people and you won't listen to the experts.

Anne Golden warned you that your megacity will start Metro "on a downward spiral to an American-style urban nightmare." Wendell Cox, another expert, warned that when you move government away from the people, it's a big mistake. He said that's what happened to US cities; that's the road they took and that's what ended up happening.

Why are you taking us down the road to an American-style city? Will you now recognize that you have to withdraw your legislation, that it's a mistake? Will you be prepared to withdraw the megacity bill?

Hon Mr Leach: I can tell you that we agree with Dr Golden when she says that despite our many strengths and advantages, we've reached the point where the status quo is no longer an option. Everybody who has reviewed any of the issues in Metro and the GTA agrees that the status quo is not an option, and we agree with that. We know our proposal to create a strong central core in the GTA by creating a single city in Metropolitan Toronto is in the best interests of not only the people of Toronto but the people of the GTA, the people of Ontario and the people of Canada. We recognize that Toronto is the economic engine of all of Canada, and this government is going to ensure that we have a strong core government to make sure that economy remains strong.

1350

Mr Cordiano: Last December I asked you, "Will you allow the people of Metro...a say in how they're going to be governed?" You stood up in this very House and said: "Let me think about that for a minute. No." The people of Toronto say that's not good enough. That kind of arrogance is nothing short of a dictatorial approach to governing and the people of Metro won't stand for that. They've thought about your megacity for much more than a minute and they say no. They've thought about your raising property taxes for much more than a minute and they say no. They've thought about your closing hospitals for much more than a minute and they say no.

I will respect the will of the people. If they vote yes on Monday night, I'll support their wishes. Will you support their wishes if the people of Metro vote no on Monday night, and then withdraw the legislation?

Hon Mr Leach: I want to correct the record because when the member indicated that I said, in his quote, "Let me think about that for a minute. No," I was referring to and answering his question whether I would support the member's private member's bill. Let's make that very clear. That was not made in reference to whether we would listen to the people of Metropolitan Toronto on this issue because we are listening to the people on this issue. There have been public hearings going on in this building for the last month. There have been town hall meetings held on a regular basis. I have attended many of those hearings. At the last committee hearing I sat in on, seven out of 10 deputants supported going to a single city, so to say everybody is against this process is absolutely wrong.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING RESTRUCTURATION DES HÔPITAUX

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): My question is for the Minister of Health. As the minister is well aware by now, two hours ago we had a revolution in this House. This House passed a resolution that tells the Ministry of Health, the Minister of Health and Premier Mike Harris to "stop cutting base funding of hospitals"; that community services must be in place; that "health services, including emergency and urgent...services," must be available to all Ontarians.

Minister, my question for you is on behalf of the 100 people who woke up at 4 o'clock this morning to be in this House to watch a majority of the members of this House pass this resolution. My question is simply this: What are you going to be doing about this?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I certainly appreciate the question from the honourable member. I had prior discussions, and discussions since the resolution was debated, with some of our members and they voted for the resolution because we agree on many of the points contained in there.

Yes, we agree, as the resolution says, that we need to restructure the hospital system and find efficiencies and savings based on the needs of those hospitals and then reinvest in community services. Of course we agree on that; that's the policy of the government and it's the work the commission is doing.

That we should allow local communities to come up with their own solutions: Yes, that's exactly why your government and the previous government spent \$26.6 million on 60 district health council studies to ensure that local communities like Windsor-Essex determined their own future with respect to the reconfiguration of hospital systems and that they would ensure there was as much local input as possible.

I agree with much of what is contained in the honourable member's resolution.

Mrs Pupatello: The resolution is very clear. The resolution says "stop cutting base funding of hospitals." The resolution says to reinvest money into those com-

munities where you are cutting. The resolution clearly speaks to not being able to cut hospital budgets while you are busy doing all this amalgamating and merging.

This is not district health, this is not some commission of hospital closures; this is you, Minister, your health policy. The majority of the members in this House today tell you that your policy is wrong. Please tell the people across Ontario, who watched with avid interest how their members voted this morning, what you will do to stop the cuts to hospitals.

Hon Jim Wilson: I'll continue to quote the resolution: We "should ensure that hospitals must be equitable and based on a formula that reflects demographic and regional needs." Too bad your party didn't think of that 10 years ago when you were in office, because the fact of the matter is for the first time in the history of the province we have a joint committee, the JPPC, which is the ministry and the hospital association —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Did you start that? Is the JPPC yours?

Hon Mr Wilson: No, but for the first time the JPPC came out with a funding formula, beginning last fiscal year, to ensure that rather than simply dealing with hospitals based on what they used to get in the past, it actually went around the province and found out what the needs are of the various communities and we have very much a needs-based budgeting formula now, so I agree with that.

The honourable member calls upon community re-investments and, as all members know, this government has invested far more money in new community services, new dollars in community services, \$170 million into new nurses for home care and homemaking services, unprecedented levels of reinvestment, far more than anything we've seen in hospital savings to date.

Mrs Pupatello: Here are 4,000 more names on a petition from Windsor alone. Ridings of London North, Niagara, Brampton North, Guelph, Niagara South, right across Ontario have sent petitions in to you supporting this resolution this morning, but more important, the representatives in this House, the majority of the members, voted in favour of the entire resolution. That is a revolution. That shows that there is not a confidence in your current health policy.

Let me be clear with a very simple example. The emergency services on the west side of Essex county are scheduled to close as of April 18. You have not reinvested for emergency services in the balance of the county but that emergency room is still going to be closed. We need to have the answer. We need you to support this resolution.

Hon Mr Wilson: This is the Win-Win report, which is the restructuring report that was done by the previous government, and we provided tens of millions of dollars when we came to office to ensure that this report, which is Windsor's own restructuring — no commission; Windsor's own restructuring: Win-Win. Your constituents named this report Win-Win, and it is a win-win because you should be proud of your constituents.

Mrs Pupatello: You haven't met your obligation for Windsor.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Member for Windsor-Sandwich, I'm warning you to come to order.

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): She's right.

The Speaker: Member for Hamilton East, this isn't a debate with the Speaker. Minister.

Hon Mr Wilson: You should be proud of your constituents for coming up and leading the way in hospital restructuring long before anybody ever heard of the Health Services Restructuring Commission.

Specific to the member's question, the deputy minister met with the officials on February 6 with respect to the closing of that particular emergency department. The members of your hospital, the western side, have been told they cannot close that emergency until the new services are in place at the Hotel Dieu Grace Hospital and the Metropolitan site. That is the policy of the government, and I know the local people are eager to follow that policy.

The Speaker: New question, leader of the third party.
1400

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): To the Minister of Health as well: On Tuesday and yesterday the Minister of Health admitted that he made a mistake with respect to cardiac surgery and the cap on cardiac surgery. He acknowledged that there is a growing list of 1,600 people across this province awaiting heart surgery, so he said he was going to remove the cap and designate a little more money for that heart surgery.

Minister, I'm here to tell you that physicians and nurses across the province say that you're only dealing with a small part of the problem. In addition to more money needed for cardiac surgery, there aren't enough nurses in many of the hospitals to provide the supports that are needed, the diagnostic equipment can't be staffed because of your hospital cuts and, frankly, the beds aren't there to handle the patients after the surgery has been done because of your hospital budget cuts.

What people want to know is, are you going to put back money into hospital budgets so that the real problem can be dealt with?

Hon Mr Wilson: Last year the government made a tremendous reinvestment, an ongoing reinvestment, of \$16 million into the system. That would have given us, and did give us, an increase of almost 20%. In fact, it was 20%, because the surgeons were actually able to do, because they're so efficient nowadays, more surgeries than we had counted on.

However, the population is growing faster and getting older and needing heart surgery more than anybody predicted. When that came to our attention, we phoned around to the hospitals. There are 277 patients who need care right away in the north, and we've flowed those dollars. I'll be meeting, as the previous minister did on February 12, on Monday with the Cardiac Care Network. As is our commitment, we would like to, together with our partners, the Cardiac Care Network and doctors in the province, come up with a comprehensive plan, from prevention through to intervention surgery and recovery and rehabilitation, a comprehensive —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Supplementary.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a supplementary with regard to the Minister of Health's tendency to make policy decisions on the back of an envelope.

Yesterday the minister said he would slow down the restructuring of rural hospitals in the province, as we

suggested in this House to his predecessor on December 17. The minister's cuts have been bleeding hospitals before they have a chance to make the savings that could make it possible to ensure services.

Could the minister explain the effects of his announcement with regard to slowing down the process for rural hospitals: what effect that has on the two hospitals in my riding that I've raised in this House, the Matthews Memorial Hospital in Richards Landing that's had all of its inpatient beds cut and closed, and the Thessalon community hospital that has had substantial cuts as well? What are the effects on those two hospitals?

Hon Mr Wilson: We're not slowing down the process at all. There are many district health councils out there that are currently developing plans. A particular concern has been raised by many members with these very small, single-hospital towns. We need to ensure that the benchmarks that are being applied by the commission and others in the large urban areas are adjusted to make sure we and the commission take into account the great distances and the weather conditions and other circumstances that are particular to rural Ontario.

I met with the hospital association this morning. They too have expressed those concerns. I've indicated my concerns to the commission. It's not slowing anything down; it's just making sure that the district health councils and those volunteers know what the rules are as they continue in their studies, because we have different benchmarks being used in different rural areas. There's been a request from district health councils to ensure they're all singing from the same hymn book.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : Ma supplémentaire au ministre de la Santé : Vous ne trouvez pas que vos politiques sont un peu broche à foin ? Vous ne comprenez pas qu'il y a des implications à long terme faisant affaire avec vos décisions.

Par exemple, l'hôpital Montfort : Il faut que vous compreniez que l'hôpital Montfort représente un hôpital de formation pour les médecins francophones, utilisé par l'Université d'Ottawa. Si vous fermez cet hôpital, les coûts que vous avez faits aux francophones ne seront pas ressentis seulement aujourd'hui, mais seront ressentis à long terme. C'est déjà assez difficile de trouver des médecins francophones, particulièrement dans des régions sous-soignées comme nous dans le nord de l'Ontario.

Monsieur le Ministre, faites-nous une faveur. On veut que vous aidiez à renverser la décision pour la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort pour éviter une situation où nous les francophones prenons l'arrière faisant affaire avec les services de soins de santé dans la province, comme vous voulez qu'on fasse.

Hon Mr Wilson: If I may, with respect to Thessalon hospital and the other hospital mentioned by the previous questioner, we actually sent back those operating plans to ensure that 24-hour care was maintained. That was not the plan of the hospital. So the fact of the matter is, I think we've seen some improvement in services there.

With respect to Montfort Hospital, I've answered several times this week that it isn't buildings that provide French-language services; it is the people. Many of those doctors, for example, currently working at the Montfort

Hospital will receive privileges at the other hospitals to ensure they continue to look after the patients and provide the French-language services that are very much needed in the Ottawa-Carleton area. In addition to that, a number of the institutions, like the General, parts of the heart institute there, the Royal Ottawa Psych, are already designated under the law to provide those services. In fact, there's an opportunity here to ensure that there's an improvement of French-language —

The Speaker: Thank you very much.

PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): I have a question also to the Minister of Health, and this concerns psychiatric hospitals. Yesterday your hospital closing commission announced that St Thomas Psychiatric Hospital and London Psychiatric Hospital will close. On Monday you announced that Brockville Psychiatric Hospital will close. Last summer you announced that Lakehead Psychiatric Hospital will close. There's a pattern developing. One would start to believe that perhaps the Queen Street and Whitby psychiatric hospitals will also close.

In each of these locations, you've refused to make a commitment to the necessary reinvestments to ensure you are not simply throwing psychiatric patients out in the street. We've asked you again and again to make that commitment but you refuse, so let me ask again today. When will you let the psychiatric patients, their families and their caregivers know what is going to happen to them? When will you announce the community reinvestment supports for psychiatric patients?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): When the honourable member's party was the government through the five years they were in office, they spent no new dollars on mental health. They cut tens of millions of dollars from mental health. We came along and we got the community investment fund up and running, put 23 million new dollars in, and those community-based programs are up. Many of them are just starting and many of them have been up and running for quite a few months now. They're serving people so that we don't see people locked up in institutions but actually served in the community.

I remind the honourable member that in London and St Thomas, about 1,600 beds were there at one time many years ago, but over the years your two parties across the way cut those beds. In the end we ended up with two big buildings, one in London, one in St Thomas, where only 38% of the physical space was being used. Therefore, the commission has recommended that those buildings be abandoned — they're very old, very outdated — and that a new psychiatric hospital be built in St Thomas.

The government will officially respond near the end of this 30-day period, but right now I think the commission —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Minister. Supplementary?

Mr Hampton: This minister is in the process of taking about \$80 million out of psychiatric health care in terms

of those hospital budgets. We ask him over and over again when he is going to announce the community reinvestments so that psychiatric patients aren't simply thrown out in the street, and he babbles on and refuses to give any announcement or any indication.

Let me tell you what your problem is. You've taken the \$80 million, but when you announced all your downloading, in effect what you said is that municipalities will have to deal with the huge burden of supporting people, that municipalities will have to deal with things like supportive housing, will have to deal with many of those community care issues. You're going to take the \$80 million out and give it to the Minister of Finance and you're going to throw the problem on to municipalities. That's what you're doing. You owe it to the people across this province to come clean. When are you going to announce —

The Speaker: Thank you, leader.

Hon Mr Wilson: The honourable member has a very difficult time taking yes for an answer. I have said and the previous minister said all the way along that we will make all the investments that are necessary and as directed by the commission. It's a little premature right now, given that the \$45 million that the commission has directed to be reinvested into community-based mental health services in the southwest —

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): People have to be able to plan, Jim.

Hon Mr Wilson: There is no plan. I invite you to right now leave the chamber, phone the commissioners and ask them what the plan is. We're fully committing, but we want to make sure there's a plan in place. Unlike the time when you were in office, the commission has directed very clearly that not one more bed cut can occur in mental health services without a full community-based plan, including full community-based reinvestment. We are going to live up to what the commission is asking. For once, the southwest will have a comprehensive mental health plan to provide the services the people in that area need.

1410

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): It's going to be wonderful for those of us from the area to be able to go back and say that the minister in the House today committed that every single dollar of operating money for St Thomas and London psychiatric hospitals will go back into the community. That's good news.

It's particularly good news in light of what happened at our briefing yesterday by the commission, where the mayor of St Thomas and councillors from the city of London asked that specific question of the commission. They said: "What do you mean this money is going to be delivering community services? We just got downloaded a huge amount of the dollars. What's wrong with this picture? Who's going to pick this up?"

Your commission was somewhat embarrassed. They were very clear that they had no idea what your intentions were about the download when they were given their mandate and that their decision-making had to be about the best delivery of services. They said very clearly

that your right hand doesn't know what your left hand is doing. That's what we've been claiming all along.

You are rushing along making these changes, and there is no guarantee to patients, their families or their communities that the resources are going to be there to look after these people who are going to be booted out of the institutions you're determined to close. Tell us clearly how you are going to deal with that download —

The Speaker: Thank you, member for London Centre.

Hon Mr Wilson: I have no idea what the honourable member's talking about with respect to downloading. Mental health services in this province have been increased significantly since this government came to office. The fact of the matter is that we will be making more investments into mental health. How can it be downloading when the Ministry of Health budget is up at least \$300 million this year? There's not an ounce of downloading going on. The fact of the matter is, the only downloading I've seen and the only downloading supported by facts in this country is the \$2 billion worth of downloading or cuts that we've received from the federal Liberal government.

LONG-TERM CARE

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): There are people here in the galleries witnessing an extraordinary outcome in terms of this minister. My question is for that Minister of Health. On May 18, 1995, your Premier promised not to close hospitals. He's closing hospitals and you and the restructuring commission are his rusty scalpel to go and do it. You're doing this by breaking promises about reinvestment. You're closing hospitals with no idea about how to make things work.

I'd refer you specifically to the situations of the frail elderly. Today, in terms of long-term care, what the Ontario Association of Non-Profit Homes and Services for Seniors says in its report is that because of the hospital cuts you've done which bring about the closing of hospitals and bring about most of the other health care problems we have in this province, 3,000 chronic care beds have closed. Last year 2,000 people were turned away from long-term-care beds because you haven't provided the funding. This is Jim Wilson's problem. You promised the reinvestment and —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, member for York South.

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): It's an astonishing question coming from the Liberal Party, the party that froze long-term-care beds in the mid-1980s. During their entire time in office, during the entire time of the NDP government, over 10 years, not one new nursing home bed or home for the aged bed was added to this province. Did the population get older? Did the population grow? Yes. We inherited that mess, that chaos. We're finding the savings in the system now.

The fiscal year 1987-88, a moratorium was placed on nursing homes and homes for the aged beds.

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): You're the one closing hospitals, remember.

The Speaker: Member for Hamilton East, come to order.

Hon Mr Wilson: Not one bed was added from the time the Liberals were in office until the time the NDP were in office.

Mr Agostino: Not one cent.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Member for Hamilton East, I've warned you on a number of occasions. I'm not getting up again to warn you. You have to come to order.

Hon Mr Wilson: Sure, the honourable members claim they went to a couple of ribbon cuttings. You simply moved licences from what you considered overbedded areas in the province to underbedded areas. The fact of the matter is that there are about 57,000 beds now, and that's the way it was over the last 10 years.

We are just finishing, along with all our partners there, a study of how many new beds we're going to need, and part of our reinvestment strategy is to identify where those needs are and reinvest the money back into new beds for seniors and for people who need them.

Mr Kennedy: I'm sure that's not the right answer because I saw this minister hold up that Win-Win report. It should have burned up in your hands, because I've been in those hospitals in Windsor and you reneged on them about the reinvestment. That's the people who have to look at you today. Can they trust you? When it comes to long-term-care beds, there are 3,000 beds gone because you cut the hospitals. There were 2,000 frail elderly turned away last year because of you. Today, the senior citizens organizations in Ontario are saying that you have a crisis that you've manufactured, and you're hurting seniors because you're not dealing with it.

The head of your own Health Services Restructuring Commission says you don't know what you're doing by dumping long-term care for the frail elderly, for home care, down on the municipalities. Your own expert is telling you to change your mind. Minister, today will you do the right thing? Will you respect the people in the galleries? Will you respect the resolution? Will you respect Eva Mulcock, a 92-year-old woman who spent six days in the emergency corridor in Queensway, then spent weeks waiting for a chronic care —

The Speaker: Thank you, member for York South.

Hon Mr Wilson: On behalf of seniors and those who need long-term-care services in this province, this government made the largest single investment in the history of Parliament, and that was \$170 million — we did it last year, before the commission started its restructuring work — that creates 4,400 new jobs for nurses and other front-line home care and home nursing providers.

We've made tremendous other reinvestments, including over \$48 million for the restructuring in Windsor. Gee, when I go to Windsor, they say, "Thank you for the reinvestment, thank you for living up to the commitments the local people put together, thank you, government, for making our hospital system more efficient and for increasing services, and thank you for the tremendous investment you've made, and for the confidence we have in the people of Windsor and the health professionals there who are making their system a better place for the people of Ontario."

1420

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a question for the Minister of Education and Training related to Bill 104 and the letter that he signed and sent to the newspaper today. We heard submissions in the committee on Bill 104 from many people who expressed their concerns that this bill has little to do with improving education and more to do with taking money out of education. Janet Allen, for instance, told the committee, "In Bill 104, I see no plan other than a fiscal one," and you say in the letter to the editor today, "As for the Education Improvement Commission — which is part of Bill 104 legislation — the commission's powers are designed to protect the interest of taxpayers; nothing more and nothing less." Will you confirm for us today what you've said in this letter to the editor, that Bill 104 isn't about improving education; it's simply about budget cuts.

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): I want to thank the member for Algoma for the question. Yes, we do have a letter the paper has been kind enough to publish today. I hope you'll read the entire letter at some point when you have the opportunity. I think that you will find that once again we have publicly said that our commitment is to having an education system in Ontario that lifts student achievement, and that's what matters to this government.

I find nothing offensive, my colleagues find nothing offensive about protecting the rights and the interests of the taxpayers of Ontario, and I'm surprised that the member opposite would be shocked that this government would have some interest in looking into that responsibility, in making sure that the investment we make in education makes a difference to the students of this province. That's what we're doing, for and on behalf of the parents, the taxpayers and the students of Ontario.

Mr Wildman: The parents and taxpayers who appeared before the committee made a number of comments. Kathleen Wynne said education is not about tax dollars and funding alone. Colleen Morris said we need to invest in education, not take money out of education. The Etobicoke Federation of Ratepayers' and Residents' Associations told the committee: "We in no way want to leave the impression that money concerns take precedence over the quality and accessibility.... Cheaper is not always better." Can the minister confirm that his so-called Education Improvement Commission, or should I say education cutbacks commission, will follow the agenda of improving education rather than simply making cutbacks to education in Ontario?

Hon Mr Snobelen: The member probably is very aware of the fact that I consider and my colleagues consider the investment in learning, the investment in students in this province to be one of the most important a government can make on behalf of the people in the province. We have continued to make sure that all our actions are consistent with that theme.

In that light, it would be very useful for all members of this chamber to accurately discuss what's contained in Bill 104, what the intention of Bill 104 is, and that is to

reduce the costs of bureaucracy, administration and duplication, so that we can direct the funds that are invested in education in the classroom, where it makes a difference with students, and not in bureaucracies and not in too many politicians.

I am proud of this bill and my colleagues are proud of this bill because it will help us to improve student achievement in this province.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING RESTRUCTURATION DES HÔPITAUX

Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound): My question is to the Minister of Health.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): Ask the right one.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr Murdoch: I'm one of those people who voted for the member for Windsor-Sandwich's resolution this morning and I want to tell you that I voted on a positive note, because my minister is doing mostly everything that's in here, and if he's not doing it he will be doing it. I want to read something in here —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Member for Grey-Owen Sound.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): Must have been an interesting lunch-hour. Who got to you?

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): Show us the booze list, Billy.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): You can be here 50 years, you'll never see the inside of cabinet.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I hope they paid for lunch, Bill.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): Kiss and make up, Bill.

Mr Kormos: Pucker up is more like it.

Mr Pouliot: Get off the floor, Bill.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Grey-Owen Sound has the floor. Please put your question.

Mr Murdoch: It's nice to hear all the things they have to say over there, but we can look at the resolution, and as I said before, the minister's doing these things: "The government of Ontario should...reinvest savings achieved through the restructuring process into local community...." In my community we would not have had dialysis machines. This is reinvestment. So maybe the Minister of Health could enlighten the opposition on some of the other things that have been happening.

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I had to put my hearing apparatus on because it's a historic day in Ontario: The member for Grey-Owen Sound agrees with a member of the cabinet of this government. But the member is quite correct. The resolution this morning was worded quite craftily so that even I, as Minister of Health, find myself agreeing with much of its wording.

There's a lot to be proud of, I think, with this government's health record over the last 18 months.

Mr Pouliot: Better shine both shoes.

The Speaker: Member for Lake Nipigon, please come to order. I don't want to debate with you about it. Just come to order. Thank you.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Do you know what come to order means? Thank you. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: We have a lot to be proud of. Today dialysis patients are receiving, in over 30 new clinics across the province, services closer to home. In Grey-Owen Sound they used to have to travel throughout the wintertime, and sometimes they would stay up all night wondering whether they could get through the snow-storm, to receive not something that's optional but something that's absolutely life-sustaining to kidney dialysis patients.

Cardiac stents weren't even heard of a few years ago in this province, and Ontario is leading the way in funding that new technology so that heart patients receive the treatment they need.

Hospital restructuring: In Thunder Bay, I remind the members, we've invested almost 60 million new dollars in that hospital system so they'll have a better hospital system. Close to \$50 million —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Supplementary.

Mr Murdoch: Restructuring had to take place and it has taken place in the public where everybody knows what's going on. It's not like what the opposition did in the last 10 years. They cut beds, they cut money to our hospitals, but they didn't tell anybody. They hid it. The opposition did it the cowardly way. They said to the hospitals: "We're just going to cut you. We're not going to let you know."

Let me read the last part of the resolution: "The government of Ontario...should ensure that health services, including emergency and urgent care services, are available to all Ontarians." We're doing this. I'm sure the health minister can tell us how we're doing exactly.

Hon Mr Wilson: Again, I appreciate the question from the member for Grey-Owen Sound. I know he and his colleague Mrs Fisher, the member for Bruce, are both fighting very hard right now to help improve the health care system in their local areas.

We've tripled the number of MRI machines in the province from 12 to 35, something other governments only talked about. We'll have more MRI machines in Ontario alone than all the rest of Canada by the time all those machines are up and running at the end of this year.

Our ambulances today: We give the best service available on the face of this earth. We have the best drugs available in those ambulances, we have defibrillators, and we're saving more lives because of that technology; over 375 new drugs added to the seniors formulary since coming; breast screening expansion, building on, in this case, the previous government's work but dramatically increasing the opportunity for breast screening for women in this province so they get early detection and can deal with that terrible disease.

You know about our hepatitis B program —

The Speaker: Thank you very much. New question.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to ask for unanimous consent to let the member for Leeds-Grenville ask the same question of the minister.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the member for Leeds-Grenville to ask the same — agreed? I heard some noes.

New question.

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): I have a question to the Minister of Health. In a televised debate on May 18, 1995, Robert Fisher asked Mike Harris, then leader of the third party, and I quote, "Can you guarantee us tonight that your pledge to protect health care will mean that you will not close hospitals?" Mike Harris responded, and I quote again: "Certainly. I can guarantee you, Robert, that it is not my plan to close hospitals." This goes right to the heart of the integrity of the Premier of Ontario.

For 14 months I have been standing virtually every day, reading a petition from my constituents in Wilson Heights concerned about the potential closing of Branson hospital. I have over 60,000 signatures. Next Thursday the Mike Harris hospital closing commission will be coming into Metro. Can you give me a guarantee that you and Mike Harris will not be closing Branson hospital?
1430

Hon Mr Wilson: I don't know what the honourable member's party was thinking when they were in government and they sent out the district health councils on several occasions and spent several million dollars to do these studies. The NDP were afraid the studies might come in during their time in office, so they sent out those thousands of volunteers, and \$26 million later and 60 studies later they sent them all out again, because, "Oh, my goodness, a study might come in and some government might have to make some decisions to improve the health care system in the province."

Mike Harris and Jim Wilson and the members of our government are not the old-style politics.

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South): That's not Mike Harris's problem.

Hon Mr Wilson: People have spent thousands of volunteer hours —

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Essex South, if you don't come to order, I'll have to name you.

Hon Mr Wilson: People in our local communities have spent thousands of volunteer hours putting together plans to improve their health care system, to improve quality, to improve access, and we're working on those plans.

I was the health critic at the time the member for Nipissing made those comments, and we had no plan to close hospitals. The plans were being developed by the local communities, and those —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Supplementary?

Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East): My question is to the Minister of Health. Ceci est une question importante à propos de l'intégrité de Mike Harris. Au cours de la dernière campagne électorale, Mike Harris a promis de ne fermer aucun hôpital. Souvenons-nous du débat des chefs pendant la campagne. En regardant en plein, droit dans la caméra, il a dit, «Certainement, je peux vous garantir qu'il ne fait pas partie de mes projets de fermer des hôpitaux.»

Lundi, vous avez annoncé la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort à Ottawa. Vous avez annoncé la fermeture du

seul hôpital de langue française en Ontario. Vous avez annoncé la fermeture du seul hôpital qui offre un programme d'enseignement de la médecine en français en Ontario.

M. Harris a déclaré qu'il porterait une attention particulière aux communautés rurales. C'est exactement un des rôles que remplit l'hôpital Montfort en desservant les résidents du comté de Prescott et Russell.

Monsieur le Ministre, pourquoi Mike Harris rompt-il sa promesse face à la communauté francophone ? Pourquoi fermez-vous —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

Hon Mr Wilson: Over 60 communities worked on studies to improve their health care system. We would have let down a lot of people in Ontario if we had sent them back to study for another five years, after almost 15 years of study in this province. It's time for decisions. It's time to take the politics out of health care. It's time to move forward. This government doesn't have a plan to close hospitals. Hospitals are not closing; the services are amalgamating. The professionals, the talent, the services are going to move into fewer sites. Get rid of the half-empty buildings and have more nurses, more technology, modern hospitals, so that when people follow that blue H on the highway, they know they're going to an emergency room that's open, that has world-class service, not the way you were running the hospitals with 18-hour emergencies.

When we came to office, there were 68 emergency rooms either closed or closing in rural Ontario. We invested —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. New question, member for Dovercourt.

Just a minute. Point of order, member for Carleton East.

Mr Morin: I'm positive that the minister did not intend to make a mistake, but it's not the district health council that recommends the closing of the hospital, it's Mike Harris, sir.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Today the Young Citizens for Local Democracy, a non-partisan, local high school students' group, has brought the results of its student referendum on your megacity to Queen's Park. They've asked us to deliver the results to you so that you can verify the results yourself, and we'll do that at the end of this question.

I also want to tell you that students, like so many others, are strongly opposed to your undemocratic megacity bill. In fact, over 80% of the over 20,000 students who participated in Toronto, East York, York and Scarborough said no to your bill.

Earlier on, you said you wished these questions had been asked separately. Well, I've got news for you. They asked four separate questions: the one on the megacity; the second one on the mega school board; the third on your download; and your placing democratically elected governments under trusteeship being the fourth. On each one of them the response was similar: over 80% against your proposal.

I want to ask you this: Are you planning to ignore the votes of these young people —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, member for Dovercourt. Minister.

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): The first thing we want to do is congratulate the students on becoming interested in the process. They are to be congratulated for getting involved in the process of what the city means to them.

We know the single-city concept for Metropolitan Toronto is broadly supported by most people in the city. The issue as to what's going to happen in the future and the type of city these young people are going to live in is very important to this government and very important to this minister. I'm going to give them a commitment now that we will not do anything to this city other than make it a greater city than it is at the present time.

Mr Silipo: Minister, it seems that your arrogance knows no bounds. In the face of these very clear results, in the face of what you now yourself are also admitting will likely be a very clear rejection on Monday in the broader referendum against your megacity proposal, you are still standing there saying that most people support this. Where are these "most people" who support this?

You yourself today are indicating that you're prepared to make some amendments to the proposal, even though as we see them, they are relatively minor in the whole concept of what you're going to be doing. But even with that little window dressing, I want to ask you this: Will you at the very least table those amendments you've leaked out through the media today so that people who will be voting on Monday will have the full picture of just what you're prepared to do? Will you at least do that if you're not prepared to listen to these young people who are here today and who have voted so strongly against your megacity and, as you clearly say, you're not prepared to listen to people on Monday?

Hon Mr Leach: As the member knows, the committee hearings are continuing through till next Thursday. There are continuous deputations during that time period. Prior to submitting any amendments we may want to make to the bill, I want to hear everybody who's going to be presenting to the committee. We don't want to disfranchise anyone who may want to make a suggestion that would cause an amendment; we want to make sure that everybody has input into the process. We'll take all of that information into consideration. We'll table the amendments next week after we've had the opportunity to listen to all of the deputants who are going to take part in the hearings.

1440

PRODUCE-YOUR-OWN BEER

Mr Douglas B. Ford (Etobicoke-Humber): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I recently read a newspaper article that some individuals in the you-brew industry routinely break the law. They are supposed to aid people who want to make their own beer, but these customers should be actively involved in the production of the product. Instead, we hear that many of these you-brews are not involving their

customers in the production of beer; they are simply selling their alcohol to the public without a licence.

A tremendous number of people are employed by well-run breweries located in the municipality of Etobicoke, where I live. I would like to know, what is the government doing to ensure that you-brew operators are going to behave within the law?

Interjections.

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I'm quite concerned. There seems to be a lot of amusement from across the floor on this issue.

I met this morning with Harry Tughan. Harry's the director of loss prevention and security for the LCBO —

Interjections.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: Mr Speaker, if these members across the way had the opportunity, as I did, to see the unsafe and unhealthy conditions of some of the illegal you-brews and you-ferments, I think they'd be concerned too. In many cases I've seen rusty containers —

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): Not in my riding. They're small business people, and you're dumping on them.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: I'm not talking about the legal you-brews. I'm talking about the illegal you-brews, and they know there's a distinction between the two.

Clearly, the illegal you-brews have some conditions that I think would really astonish people across the way. There are some situations where they are using old agricultural pesticide containers. That's not good for public consumption. Clearly it's not.

While on the topic, certainly the you-brews are there to provide a service for people for their own use, as a hobby to produce their own beer or services. The you-brews are supposed to provide —

The Speaker: Thank you. Supplementary?

Mr Ford: Minister, you-brews are not the only source of illegal alcohol being sold in Ontario. What is your ministry doing to combat the illegal wines being distributed throughout the province?

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: We are working very diligently to try to curb smuggling and the production of illegal liquor in the province. The LCBO has taken a number of initiatives to address these concerns, including creating a special task force which involves a number of endorsement agencies, including the RCMP, Revenue Canada, the Ministry of Finance and the LLBO. In 1995-96, the special investigations unit was involved in 79 investigations, which have netted \$10.5 million in seizures.

This is a serious issue. We are working actively right now. As I mentioned before, we're working with Mr Tughan, the director of loss prevention and security for the LCBO, to provide a strategy to better enforce the rules against illegal you-brews. It's clearly illegal you-brews we're concerned with.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North): My question is to the Minister of Health. On Monday of this week, your hospital restructuring commission announced that it

would delaying its restructuring process in Lambton county because, according to its press release, that is, the commission's press release, it had been told by your ministry that your department would be "developing a new policy for restructuring small hospitals in rural and northern Ontario." Can you indicate to the House today specifically what the ingredients of your new hospital policy will be with respect to rural hospitals and hospitals in northern Ontario?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): A number of parties, including the Ontario Hospital Association, have indicated that there needs to be a little bit of work done in a short period of time to make sure that all the district health councils in these very small towns, very small villages in some cases, that have a very small hospital — a comprehensive policy for those needs to be looked at. The policy right now is to use benchmarks that may or may not always be appropriate.

We're not talking about the Pembrokes, where it's a two-hospital town. We're talking about just these very small areas. All members have expressed the fact that we want to ensure that patients continue to have access to quality services, and the definition of "access" has never really been clarified in this province.

Mr Conway: You are talking about the rural Ottawa Valley, which I represent. You and your commission have stayed proceedings in Grey-Bruce and in Sarnia-Lambton, and I'm going to tell you something, buster: There is little or no difference between the rural Ottawa Valley and Grey-Bruce and Petrolia-Lambton.

I want to know today, on behalf of the people in communities like Barry's Bay and Pembroke and Deep River and Renfrew and Arnprior, what are the specific ingredients of your new policy with respect to restructuring hospitals in rural small-town and northern Ontario, and will you give my communities, including Pembroke, the benefit of your new policy?

Hon Mr Wilson: Absolutely. I asked today that the Ontario Hospital Association put forward a representative to sit on a little committee to look at this matter. Excuse me, all members of all caucuses: It was the briefing that was provided. Your caucuses were invited to have a briefing from the commission, and in that they said, "Before we get into rural Ontario we need the government, we need all members to think about these little hospitals in these little towns."

Based on that, we've asked the Ontario Hospital Association to put forward a representative, and the Ontario Medical Association and about three or four other groups we've made the phone calls around to, to invite members to have input.

We want to take a look to make sure that "access" is defined in our rural areas. The commission welcomes the opportunity right now for input from people and I certainly welcome your input and that of your constituents. Whenever we put this together, we'll be sure to let all the district health councils and all the members know what the definition of access is for these rural areas.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Point of order, member for London Centre.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): Not surprisingly, Mr Speaker, under standing order 34(a), I wish to express dissatisfaction with the answer of the Minister of Health and I will be filing the papers.

The Speaker: File the notice papers and that'll be acceptable.

Motions?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I have no motions but I would ask that I be able to give the weekly business statement.

Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to indicate the business of the House for the week of March 3, 1997.

On Monday, March 3, the House will debate Bill 98 at second reading.

Tuesday, March 4, will be an opposition day and the House will meet in the name of the member for Oakwood, Mr Colle, and the House will also complete second reading of Bill 109.

On Wednesday, March 5, the House will complete second reading of Bill 106.

On Thursday, March 6, the House will complete second reading of Bill 98. In addition, it is certainly the hope of the government and I believe the hope of all parties in this House that at some time during the week we'll be able to accommodate Bill 125.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): That's certainly my hope as — no. I thought we were adjourning; that's what I thought.

PETITIONS

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3 billion in cuts to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to call on the Conservative government to stop the cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must fund hospitals with a funding formula that reflects demographic and regional needs. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

I affix my signature as I'm in full agreement with this petition.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I continue to receive petitions from workers all across Ontario, both unionized and non-union, expressing concern about this government's continuing attack on their rights in the workplace.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Harris government has begun a process to open the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario; and

"Whereas this act is the single most important piece of legislation for working people since it is designed to protect our lives, safety and health while at work and allow us to return home to our families in the same condition in which we left; and

"Whereas the government has made it clear that they intend to water down the act and weaken the rights of workers under the law, including the right to know, the right to participate and especially the right to refuse unsafe work; and

"Whereas this government has already watered down proper training of certified committee members;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario not to alter the Occupational Health and Safety Act or erode the rights of workers any further and ensure strict enforcement of the legislation."

On behalf of the members of the NDP, I add my name.

1450

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mrs Brenda Elliott (Guelph): I have a petition from constituents in my riding. It reads exactly the same as the petition just presented by the member for St Catharines, so in the interest of expediency and allowing other members to read their petitions, I submit it on behalf of my constituents.

NORTH YORK BRANSON HOSPITAL

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee has recommended that North York Branson Hospital merge with York-Finch hospital;

"Whereas this recommendation will remove emergency and inpatient services currently provided by North York Branson Hospital, which will seriously jeopardize medical care and the quality of health for the growing population which the hospital serves, many being elderly people who in numerous cases require treatment for life-threatening medical conditions;

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reject the recommendation contained within the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee as it pertains to North York Branson Hospital, so that it retains, at minimum, emergency and inpatient services."

I have affixed my signature.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario from residents of the Bridge End Housing Cooperative in my riding.

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"We respectfully petition the government of Ontario to cease to amend the existing signed operating agreements with provincially and federally-provincially funded housing cooperatives. As members of provincial housing cooperatives, we recognize that provincial housing cooperatives make economic sense as an affordable housing alternative to the private sector."

I'm proud to affix my signature.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): I have more petitions on drunk driving countermeasures addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas drinking and driving is the largest criminal cause of death and injury in Canada;

"Whereas every 45 minutes in Ontario a driver is involved in an alcohol-related crash;

"Whereas most alcohol-related accidents are caused by repeat offenders;

"Whereas lengthy licence suspensions for impaired driving have been shown to greatly reduce repeat offences;

"Whereas the victims of impaired drivers often pay with their lives while only 22% of convicted impaired drivers go to jail and even then only for an average of 21 days;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We urge the provincial government to pass legislation that will strengthen measures against impaired drivers in Ontario," of course referring to the Marland bill. I affix my own signature thereto.

FIRE SAFETY

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

This is signed by 25 additional concerned Ontarians. I have affixed my signature because, like these Ontarians, I agree that we do not want to get burned by Bill 84.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): I have a petition as well addressed to the Legislative Assembly which reads as follows:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

This is signed by residents of Collingwood. I agree with the petitioners and I have signed it as well.

GO TRANSIT

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Simcoe Centre): Commuting is a big issue in my riding. I am presenting a petition signed by approximately 1,185 people who commute to jobs in the Toronto area and want the government of Ontario to maintain GO rail service to Bradford. The petition is signed by residents of Barrie, Innisfil, Bradford, West Gwillimbury, as well as the nearby communities of Tottenham, Bolton, Schomberg, Holland Landing, Newmarket, Keswick, Aurora, King City, Maple and Woodbridge.

VIDEO LOTTERY TERMINALS

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition that reads as follows:

"Since video lottery terminals will contribute to gambling addiction in Ontario and the resulting breakup of families, spousal and child abuse and crimes such as embezzlement and robbery;

"Since the introduction of video lottery terminals across Ontario will provide those addicted to gambling with widespread temptation and will attract young people to a vice which will adversely affect their lives for many years to come;

"Since the introduction of these gambling machines across our province is designed to gain revenue for the government at the expense of the poor, the vulnerable and the desperate in order that the government can cut income taxes, to the greatest benefit of those with the very highest income;

"Since the placement of video lottery terminals in bars in Ontario and in permanent casinos in various locations across the province represents an escalation of gambling opportunities;

"Since Premier Harris and Finance Minister Eves were so critical of the provincial government becoming involved in further gambling ventures and making the government more dependent on gambling revenues to maintain government operations,

"We, the undersigned, call upon Premier Mike Harris and the government of Ontario to reconsider its announced decision to introduce the most insidious form of gambling, video lottery terminals, to restaurants and bars in the province."

I affix my signature as I'm in complete agreement with this petition.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North): I have the following petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it reads:

"Speed, experience and teamwork save lives. Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I affix my signature to this petition.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Dan Newman (Scarborough Centre): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It's signed by a number of citizens from Scarborough, including a person who's here in the gallery today. The petition reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the city of Scarborough is requiring individuals who want to participate in the mail-in referendum to provide their name, address and signature on the ballot; and

"Whereas this requirement is blatantly undemocratic and threatens the legitimacy of the democratic process; and

"Whereas the city of Scarborough makes no mention as to whether or not it will accept ballots from residents who wish to vote in confidence; and

"Whereas the question on the ballot itself is slanted towards the position of the city and cannot be viewed as a neutral question; and

"Whereas this uncertainty and undemocratic procedure makes the entire process a great misuse of taxpayers' dollars and tarnishes any results that will come out of the vote;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario to

"(1) Speak out against this undemocratic vote;

"(2) Disregard the results of the vote; and

"(3) Continue the proposed unification of the municipalities into one unified city of Toronto."

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Speed, experience and teamwork save lives: Don't get burned by Bill 84. Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I've affixed my signature to it.

SEXUAL ASSAULT CRISIS CENTRES

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): This petition reads:

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas sexual assault is a crime and the effects of abuse last a lifetime for the survivors of these crimes;

"Whereas sexual assault crisis centres provide community-based, women-positive, cost-effective services which recognize and respond to both recent, historical and childhood sexual assaults, offering short-term crisis intervention, longer-term therapy, public education, prevention, court and police support;

"Whereas hospital-based treatment centres are mandated primarily to work with survivors of recent sexual assaults with a medical/forensic approach, offering only short-term counselling and referrals, while adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse or historical assaults need longer-term services to recover from the horrendous crimes they have suffered;

"Whereas if Parliament decides to close sexual assault crisis centres and redistribute drastically reduced funds to treatments centres, most adult survivors of sexual assault will not have the services they need to heal and will be further victimized;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario to maintain community-based sexual assault crisis centres."

I affix my signature to this petition.

1500

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr John L. Parker (York East): I continue to receive this petition from residents from across East York. This particular one was circulated in the Thorncliffe area of East York and it reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the borough of East York is requiring voters in the current mail-in referendum to return their ballots in envelopes bearing their names and addresses; and

"Whereas the ballots are to be forwarded to the borough of East York at the East York Civic Centre and not to an independent elections commission; and

"Whereas the East York council has declared itself in favour of a particular result in the referendum; and

"Whereas the question itself is prejudicial in its wording and clearly slanted towards the result favoured by council; and

"Whereas all of the above factors violate well-established and universally acknowledged principles of a free democratic referendum process;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to:

"(1) Speak out against the current flawed, undemocratic referendum in East York;

"(2) Disregard the results of the vote; and

"(3) Proceed with the government's program to provide for Toronto's future through the creation of one Toronto for all of us."

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South): I have a petition sponsored by local community fire safety committees that is addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Speed, experience and teamwork save lives. Don't get burned by Bill 84.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

In support of this I add my signature.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I wish to add these voices to those who are calling for changes to Bill 84 and support firefighters.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional

firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I add my name to theirs.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): I have a petition from 19 members of my riding passed on to me by the member for Windsor-Sandwich. It parrots her earlier resolution of the day, so I won't read it, and I won't affix my signature because I disagree with some of its contents.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition that says:

"Don't get burned by Bill 84.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I affix my signature to this petition as I am in full agreement with its contents.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I have another petition which adds voices to those who are concerned about fire safety in the province.

"Speed, experience and teamwork save lives. Don't get burned by Bill 84.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I have affixed my signature as I am in agreement with this petition.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Pursuant to standing order 34(a), the member for London Centre has given notice of her dissatisfaction with the answer to her question given by the Minister of Health concerning the impact of downloading on the delivery of community-based services where psychiatric hospitals close. This matter will be debated today at 6 pm.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

STREAMLINING OF ADMINISTRATION OF PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ACT, 1997

LOI DE 1997 SIMPLIFIANT L'ADMINISTRATION EN CE QUI A TRAIT AUX INFRACTIONS PROVINCIALES

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 108, An Act to deal with the

prosecution of certain provincial offences, to reduce duplication and to streamline administration / *Projet de loi 108, Loi traitant des poursuites concernant certaines infractions provinciales, réduisant le double emploi et simplifiant l'administration.*

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Further debate. The Chair recognizes the member for St Catharines.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The last speaker, as I understand it, was the parliamentary assistant. It seems to me that the members are entitled to their rotation of questions and responses to that member's comments on Bill 108. The rules provide for that.

The Acting Speaker: I'm informed that by tradition we don't follow that procedure when the member is not here; we follow rotation. We'll move now to Mr Bradley.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I am pleased to be able to take part in debate on Bill 108; the streamlining of provincial offences act, it says, but this government has, as you know better than anyone, Mr Speaker, used a new method of putting phoney names on the bills that suit the government's purposes. That doesn't seem to be contrary to the rules, I suppose, but if one were to read what it says about the bill, one would certainly not be taken in by that suggestion.

I want to say from the start that the purpose of this bill obviously is to try to garner some favour with the municipalities for being dumped upon by the provincial government. It reminds me — and I was at a meeting last night in St Catharines of a group of individuals concerned about the deterioration of government services in Ontario. One of the people pointed out that you're going to see something like a town in Mississippi where you drive through and you go down the hill, and at the top of the hill the speed limit — it's in miles per hour in the US — would be perhaps 30 miles per hour, and when you get down to the bottom of the hill it's 15 miles per hour. It's usually worse than that. It's probably 50 miles an hour at the top of the hill and 15 miles an hour at the bottom of the hill so they can garner some additional funds.

The Solicitor General, who is in the gallery today with the dean of the press gallery, Eric Dowd, is a person who would know about this and be concerned that now we're going to have people applying the law in different ways, depending on how much a community might need in revenue, and heaven knows they're going to need the money in revenue because of all the downloading or dumping of responsibility from the provincial government on to local governments.

Almost to a person, even a lot of Conservatives, not all of them, but even a lot of Conservatives I know on local councils are now refusing to apologize for Mike Harris, are refusing to apologize for the downloading of responsibilities on the municipalities. While they may say there might be a dollar or two to be made from this jurisdiction coming into being for them, they really would prefer that the provincial government keep this jurisdiction and also keep many items they've downloaded on the municipalities. As you know as members of this assembly, local municipalities are beside themselves over the prospect of something happening, that prospect being — the roof is

leaking in here, I think. There's something falling from the roof of this building right now.

Mr Kormos: It's easy for you to say. It's not falling on you.

Interjections.

Mr Bradley: There is a problem arising in the House. I don't want to be interrupted in my speech, but there is fallout coming from a vent in the ceiling, and you may wish to find out what that is all about.

It reminds me of the downloading on municipalities.

Mr Derwyn Shea (High Park-Swansea): Mr Speaker, on a matter of privilege: Could you be good enough to indicate to the honourable members what is falling from the sky? I'm used to manna. This doesn't seem to fall into that category. Would you be good enough to tell us what this is, Speaker? I know I've been listening to the camel leading us through the desert, but what is this?

The Acting Speaker: I think that we'll look after the clock for the member for St Catharines.

On the point of order from the member for High Park-Swansea, we're not sure, and above all, I don't know any more about it than you, but it is being looked into. As soon as I have anything else, I'll make it known to you.

I guess at this point I should ask: Would the member for St Catharines like to proceed or would you like —

Mr Bradley: I will be pleased to proceed. I think it was the reverend from the west end of Toronto who intervened, appropriately, and I think it's an indication that I'm right about downloading. Just as I mentioned the downloading by the provincial government on municipalities, immediately some material was coming from the ceiling of this building from a vent, and indeed the sky is falling in Ontario. It's quite obvious that at least the wheels are coming off the provincial government programs.

1510

On a more serious note, although this in itself is serious, I want to say that just as the members of this assembly are worried about material coming from a vent in the ceiling and falling upon us, so the members of municipalities out there, municipal councillors, board of education people are worried about what's falling on them as a result of the initiatives of this provincial government.

Let's say that perhaps they want to see this bill pass in some municipalities because it's a potential source of income for them. However, I say to the members of this assembly that what they would really prefer is that you rethink your downloading on to municipalities.

This gets to a theme about which all of us are talking these days. If you talk to anyone, even my Conservative friends, they will tell you that the government is moving too quickly and too drastically and not looking at the consequences of its actions. Obviously even some of the government members who are not in the cabinet are beginning to say that to the cabinet ministers and to the people who really run the government: the people who advise the Premier, the highly paid help in the Premier's office who are not elected but of course who are much smarter than the members in their minds.

I want to say that we would not require this piece of legislation if indeed that downloading would stop. Let me

tell you how I think we would negate the need for this piece of legislation — wise it may be or wise it may not be — and that is by saying soon to the municipalities: “Look, we made a mistake. We’re the Ontario government. I am Premier Harris. I have made a mistake and I shouldn’t have downloaded long-term medical care, which is largely for seniors in our province, on to municipalities because those costs are bound to increase rather drastically.”

Because those costs are increasing, that means we, as a municipality, have only a couple of choices. One choice is to drastically increase municipal property taxes that do not take into account a person’s ability to pay. In other words, whether you’re rich or poor, you still have to pay the taxes when the tax bill comes out; whether you’re working or not in a particular year or set of months, you still have to pay your municipal taxes.

I think when they see this happening, when they see that they are faced with this onerous responsibility of so-called long-term care, as it is largely care for seniors; medical care in many cases for Alzheimer patients in our province who are facing very great difficulties not only for themselves but for their caregivers, and that’s usually members of the family —

What we’re seeing now are some municipalities that own homes for the aged, as they are called, saying they may have to privatize. When we privatize, there are a couple of consequences. One is that the people working there obviously could lose their jobs or have to take jobs with a new firm without any particular benefits or with a significantly reduced paycheque. That’s an attack on people who are not highly paid now but at least have some benefits and some sense of dignity with the amount of money they are receiving. That’s one group of people.

A second consequence might be to drastically increase user fees for these facilities, again placing an onus on senior citizens and their families as the municipality finds it impossible to meet these costs from the municipal property tax.

A third is that we could see some significant cuts in the level of service. Already because of provincial cutbacks of funding, we have seen homes for the aged lay people off, cut the hours and cut some of the resources available, even though the people who run them don’t want to do so, even though the administration are concerned about this. We are finding a deterioration of the service that can be provided because of a reduction in the staff. So that’s one thing.

I think the provincial government is probably ready to capitulate on this issue because, as you know, those of us in the opposition have raised this issue many times, the people of this province have raised this issue, and our local municipal representatives have raised this issue.

If you were to take it back, and I hope you do capitulate, I won’t say, “Sound the bugles of retreat,” or that I hear the backup beep, beep sound coming. I won’t say any of those things. I will applaud the provincial government and Premier Harris for recognizing the mistake that has been made in trying to download on municipalities responsibilities for seniors’ long-term care and long-term care for other disabled people.

You might say, what else would necessitate not having to pass this bill, not having to deal with this bill? A

second thing would be for the province to retain responsibility for ambulance services, because that’s being dumped on local municipalities. Many of them don’t have the wherewithal to deal with this, so they will go to the private sector.

Who is waiting on the sidelines? My friend from Welland-Thorold was mentioning at a meeting last night that they were lined up at the Peace Bridge just waiting for this decision. We have companies such as Metro/Rural Corp from the United States, which serves some 200 communities in the United States, hovering above Ontario, saying that this looks like, as they would call it, a good marketplace, and wanting to move in.

I can tell you that in Buffalo and in northern New York state, where that company exists, it costs a significant amount of money, over \$200, simply to get into the ambulance, and if you want any kind of detailed service while you’re in the ambulance, kind of life-saving service, that goes up over \$300, and you have to pay \$5.45 a mile in addition to that. If they have to get out the Band-Aids or splints or if you have to have oxygen or an intravenous, that costs as well. What I’m saying is that if you didn’t download this on municipalities and they weren’t forced to privatize, they might say, “We won’t need Bill 108, then; we’re mildly supportive now in some municipalities, but we won’t need Bill 108.”

I know there are people concerned about that. I notice that one of the councillors who would be concerned about this, Councillor Judy Casselman of St Catharines, is sitting in the members’ gallery. I’ll introduce her; we can have a round of applause, I’m sure, for her this afternoon.

Applause.

Mr Bradley: You will notice that I had quoted her husband, Dr Casselman, in previous debates in this House because of course I was mentioning on that occasion — you can relate to this, Mr Speaker — the potential closure of Hotel Dieu Hospital. He had submitted an outstanding brief which cautioned the government not to be proceeding so quickly.

It fits into this bill. You may say: “How does that possibly fit into this bill? How does this man come up with things that don’t seem to fit this bill?” Let me tell you how it fits this bill.

Just as the expert he was quoting from the United States, who had done some significant studies on these matters, was saying, “Take your time; don’t quickly proceed with the closing of hospitals; look carefully before you do this,” I think municipalities are saying it to the people of this province, are particularly saying it to the government benches, all of whom are in rapt attention this afternoon at the remarks I am offering for their consideration. That’s something else you don’t have to download.

Another thing is the responsibility for welfare, which is in two categories: welfare which is on an emergency basis, a relatively short-term basis, and longer-term welfare, which is for disabled people and mothers’ allowance, for instance, for people where the spouse has taken a hike and he’s nowhere to be found and we need some help for the mother in order that she can look after the children. That’s going to be dumped on the municipalities.

You see, they only have one way they can tax. That's the municipal property tax. As I've said on many occasions, and I have to repeat this because obviously the message doesn't quickly get through, it doesn't take into account the person's ability to pay. If you take St Catharines, for instance, where we have a relatively high unemployment rate, if a person is unemployed for perhaps as long as a year, that person's income tax goes down, because they're not making as much money. However, the property tax bill still comes out from the municipality, and when that property tax bill is going to increase significantly, that's going to place an even greater onus on that individual.

1520

But what is this government doing? It's giving an income tax cut, which will benefit the wealthiest people in the province the most, and it is going to force an increase in the property tax, which of course is easiest for wealthy people to pay compared to people who don't have the same means. This is completely backwards as to where it should be, but of course the provincial government can then go around taking credit for a tax cut and place the blame on municipalities for raising taxes or for cutting service or for implementing unpopular and often unnecessary user fees.

Municipal councillors I'm aware of right across Ontario, whether they're Liberals or Conservatives or New Democrats or have no political affiliation, are getting together to unite; they're putting aside their political considerations. They're not apologizing for Mike Harris, they're not apologizing for members of the cabinet; they're saying, "We stand up for our municipalities first, and we're going to speak to this government and try to change its mind."

This week it appears the wheels are flying off the Common Sense Revolution, because the government has had a bad week, to this point in time. The hospitals are closing left and right. That places an onus on a community. You would know this, Mr Speaker, as well as any one of us. When you close a hospital and all those people lose jobs — and you're already firing the nurses and other workers in the hospital out the door — those people don't have the ability to pay their property taxes, and they may fall into arrears. Therefore, the municipality has to raise taxes even more to make up for the fact that some people cannot afford them.

I say to you who sit on the government benches, you should be approaching the Premier — I know he told the member for Wentworth North that they could win the riding with or without him, and I thought that was rather unfortunate they would say that, when the member for Wentworth North had the intestinal fortitude to stand up against the policy of the government in caucus. The Premier, I'm told from a reliable source I read, said, "Well, we can win that riding with or without you." I don't think that's fair.

I want to give the member for Wentworth North credit for standing up to the Premier of this province. It's too bad many of the others wouldn't, but of course many of them are trying to grease the skids into the cabinet and are hopeful that if they laugh loud enough at the Premier's jokes and if they say, "Yes, sir, no, sir, three

bags full, sir," they might just get in the cabinet. But my friend the member for Wentworth North knows that path might not be his, and he has chosen to make a stand on behalf of his constituents. I want to commend him for opposing government policy which is unwise government policy. I simply hope it's contagious and some of the other members will follow his lead.

It would be interesting to have a microphone — although one should never say this, because it reminds us of the Watergate break-in — but it would be interesting nevertheless to fantasize about a microphone in the government caucus room, because then you could hear some of the things that are said.

I remember when the Speaker of the House here, Mr Chris Stockwell, the member for Etobicoke West, used to sit in the government caucus. He tried to bring some sense to the cabinet, and he would be a person around whom other members could rally. I want to commend him. Today he voted for a resolution initiated by the opposition when there was a tie to be broken. It just shows how impartial he is, and it shows how perceptive he is of the needs of the people of this province, and I hope he doesn't use this in his campaign literature. But I want to commend him for that initiative.

When I'm looking at the Provincial Offences Act, as I do when I'm dealing with legislation, I also try to say, "This government doesn't want a lot of legislation." My friend the member for Lincoln must have been beside himself today when one of the members got up to ask for some kind of regulation dealing with you-brews, because the member for Lincoln wants to get rid of all the regulations we have, and now it appears the government wants to move in that direction.

But I digress, Mr Speaker, and you're so kind and understanding enough to let me digress from time to time during my remarks. But I do want to say there are other areas that you are dumping on municipalities as a government. For one thing, you're cutting their funding left and right. When I see heritage, which is so important — and I must say Councillor Casselman from St Andrews ward in St Catharines is noted for trying to preserve the heritage; she's been one of the leaders in our municipality in trying to preserve the heritage in our community. I can't speak for her, naturally, but I know she must be very concerned when she sees a diminishing of the funds available from the provincial level to meet the heritage needs of this province.

There was a time when the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario thought a lot about heritage. It wasn't a party of bulldozers; it was a party that was careful and cautious. That's what I'm advocating. I don't agree with what you're doing, but maybe you want to move forward with your agenda. Most people are saying, "Would you be more cautious. Would you be as Bill Davis was," or John Robarts, people of that ilk, Bob Welch, who was a Deputy Premier in this province and served with distinction the riding of Brock and St Catharines-Brock for so many years, and Lincoln previous to that.

These are people who moved with caution, who looked to the consequences of their actions before they moved forward, who weren't caught on some ideological bent which said they must get rid of virtually everybody who

works in the public sector and provides service in the public sector.

Members of the assembly must be getting telephone calls from their local municipalities, from their municipal councillors, saying, "We can't possibly handle all the roads you want to dump on us for responsibility." They've already deteriorated under this provincial government, which has not spent the money to maintain those roads, so they're saying to us who sit in this House, "Would you please inform Premier Harris, who is the author of this downloading, that he indeed should not be dumping the responsibility for these provincial roads on to local municipalities and should continue to provide some transfer payments for us to carry out our responsibilities."

I know the Premier generally promised that we would have good roads in this province, just as I remember when he said to Robert Fisher on May 18, 1995, during the leaders' debate in the election campaign — I have what was the exact terminology again — "Certainly, Robert, I can guarantee you I have no plans to close hospitals." I'm sure that applied to roads and other services. We didn't hear about those plans. The Conservative candidates in our area certainly didn't say they were going to be downloading on the municipalities all the responsibilities that you're downloading upon them. They didn't say you would be bringing in megacities and destroying the small towns and villages and municipalities that this government seems bent on destroying.

Those kinds of communities have served us well in years gone by. They've been the closest to the people. At one time, of course, the Conservative Party stood for local government: The government that was local was the closest to the people. You could always count on the Conservatives to take that stance, which tells me of course this is not the Progressive Conservative Party in power but rather some rump of the Reform Party that sits in the Parliament, with a few exceptions, no doubt, of people who might still be considered to be Progressive Conservatives. But by and large it's the Reform rump, and they must be beside themselves again because I saw in the newspaper today that the Reform Party was warning some of the members of the Conservative Party, "Don't you dare support the federal Conservatives or we'll get you in the next election." That is important for this party.

Mr Kormos: I agree.

Mr Bradley: The member for Welland-Thorold knows that, because he is well aware that without the Reform Party vote, this crowd wouldn't be in power right now. So if you offend them too much — you have to be very careful because you'll lose that natural support that you have. I know some of the members here squire the leader of the Reform Party around the riding when he shows up and show up at the meetings, things of that nature.

I become concerned when I see that kind of influence because that's not the Conservative Party that I know. Those aren't the Conservatives with whom I have associated in the past; yes, as an opposition person, but I found those people to be somewhat reasonable and open-minded compared to the crowd that we face today across from us in the assembly.

So this act is one which wouldn't be necessary if we didn't have this downloading on the municipalities.

There are other areas — the member for Welland-Thorold would be able to prompt me on this — where they are downloading on to municipalities, because people in Welland are well aware of this. They're saying at the same time, "While you're doing this, you're closing other institutions." The Thorold detention centre is being closed. That makes absolutely no sense at all.

1530

Again, it goes back to the theme of the difference between the Reform Party that's in power now and the old Progressive Conservative Party. The Progressive Conservative Party understood the need for institutions of this kind close to the communities so that the family could go out to visit, so there could be some counselling take place of a local nature. Because, believe it or not, these people are coming out of jail eventually. Better that they come out with some counselling, better that they come out to a halfway house before heading into neighbourhoods, better that they come out with some of the services that used to be provided than throwing them all together in a huge mega-jail, a huge jail which, yes, might be a bit cheaper in the short run to operate but in the long run will produce worse criminals than you've ever seen before, that will result in almost no rehabilitation taking place. That's affecting our community as well as they close that institution and others.

This is all in the context as well. Our people would say, "Look, if you weren't dumping so many of the health responsibilities on the local people, we wouldn't have to do this." You would know, Mr Speaker, because in your area there are people lurking out there trying to close hospitals. I think Listowel is one place that you would be concerned about, just as I am in the Niagara region, where the local hospital restructuring commission has been forced to come up with a report to close hospitals because the government has said that they are going to withdraw \$44 million more — that's after the cuts already taking place — out of hospital care in our province. This at a time when in Boom, Bust and Echo, the best-selling book now, the author, Mr Foot, says we shouldn't be quickly closing hospitals that we may have to open again.

I become concerned about that. I never heard anything from any Conservative candidate about closing hospitals last election. Did you, Peter?

Mr Kormos: Not a word.

Mr Bradley: The member for Welland-Thorold did not either. The member for Kingston and The Islands nods no, he did not hear anything about that, and yet we're seeing hospitals being closed in every community, including the Solicitor General's community.

Mr Kormos: People in the galleries are shaking their heads; they're saying no.

Mr Bradley: And the people in the galleries today knew that, the ones who were here this morning to support the resolution of the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

So I look to the Conservative caucus. We don't have the power over here. We don't have the power because we have 31 members and the New Democrats have 15 members and there's one independent.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): They're going down all the time: 14?

Mr Bradley: There could even be 14 members now, I'm told. But whatever number there are in the NDP and the Liberals, we cannot overcome the majority of 82. The only time that we can deal in a relatively non-partisan sense is when we have private members' hour.

That's why this morning it was encouraging to see half a dozen government members stand up and vote with the opposition. I know they're getting the heat at home, and people can say, "Oh well, it's only because they're responding to the heat," but what I'm saying is, I don't care whether they're responding to heat locally, whether it's the pressure, whatever it is. At least they stood up to vote with the opposition, who recognize that the government policy is wrongheaded. When these people will admit that government policy is wrongheaded, I think we're making progress. I call upon more of them to do so, and I call upon them in our own communities to come out and say to the Conservative government not, "Yes, Mike, you're doing a good job. Here's \$200 for the fundraiser," but to come out and say: "Mike, we don't think you're doing a good job; we don't agree with everything you're doing. Some of the things we may agree with, some of the things may be reasonable, but you know, you're moving too quickly. You're moving like a bulldozer and you're not paying attention to your own members even."

They treat you as though you're stupid or something, and you're not. You are elected people. You know better than anybody else, because you're elected at the local level, what the pulse of your community is, what people are saying to you, not the people who you know are going to say what you want to hear, but generally out there. You're a better barometer of the province of Ontario than anybody who works in the Premier's office or any of the assistants to the ministers or in fact our good people in the civil service, who don't have the same opportunity to be out in the community that all of you have.

For this reason, I ask you to rise up against the Common Sense Revolution, stand for real common sense, slow the government down, make the government more cautious, make the government more responsible, because if you do so, you're going to get some applause from those of us in the opposition who to this point in time have seen far too little of that initiative. That is why I believe there's not even a need to proceed with Bill 108, if you do what I have suggested and stop the downloading.

The Acting Speaker: Before we go to comments and questions, I just want to inform the House that my best information is that a window blew in upstairs. It stirred up some dust and of course it came down on us. For the benefit of the pages, and of course the members too, it has not been deemed unsafe in here so we don't have the right to refuse work. We'll proceed. Questions and comments?

Mr Kormos: I have no doubt that what fell on us from the rafters was far less dangerous than what sits over here on the government side on a daily basis.

I'm very grateful to the member for St Catharines and his comments. At first blush — he as much as indicated

this — this looks like a relatively innocuous bill. Some would wonder why the member for St Catharines would speak at such length, 30 minutes. Some would wonder why I'm going to speak to it for 90 minutes next, and I tell you —

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): For 90 minutes? I'm outta here.

Mr Kormos: Yes, for 90 minutes. It's important to understand that this is but another piece of the puzzle. It may be a smaller piece of the puzzle, it may be a less obvious piece of the puzzle, but it's part and parcel, as the member for St Catharines said, of the downloading of the big Harris dump on taxpayers and on communities across Ontario, of the cutbacks, of the shutdowns of hospitals and schools, and yes, of correctional institutes and detention centres, of the attack on students and the attack by this government on the sick and on seniors and on workers and on young people.

It's all part and parcel, and if we're going to debate it meaningfully, we're going to have to discuss it in the context of what this government has been doing here since June 1995.

I also want to note that this is a bill, not inappropriately, sponsored by the Attorney General. I think it's appropriate then that we talk a little bit about the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Attorney General, and I intend to, especially the disdain his ministry has shown for leading jurists like Chief Justice LeSage and Chief Justice McMurtry. I'm going to be making reference to some comments that were reported in the *Law Times* released just a couple of days ago, wherein the ministry and the Attorney General showed contempt, quite frankly. He showed contempt for the comments these jurists had made about the Attorney General's incompetence in his failure to fund criminal justice here in Ontario.

Mr Dan Newman (Scarborough Centre): It's a pleasure to rise today to respond to the member for St Catharines. In his presentation today, he doesn't give much faith to municipalities and I'm shocked at that. Bill 108, this transfer, gives municipalities a stronger role under the Provincial Offences Act and it's consistent with the province's commitment to eliminating waste and duplication and to consolidating service delivery at one level of government.

We are creating a new revenue source for municipalities which can be spent on further improving local services, even after the costs of this new responsibility are taken into account. It's built on a successful transfer of parking tickets to municipalities initiated by the NDP government in 1993. The results have been service at a lower cost to the public. I think that's very important to keep in mind.

This government is now taking the next logical step. This government is consolidating administration of provincial offences, primarily ticketable offences, at one level of government, thereby eliminating waste and duplication. For example, administrative processes are duplicated when two offices process a single certificate of offence. With our changes, only the municipal office would process this certificate.

It's important to keep in mind some of the municipalities in 1993 that opted in: Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ottawa, St Catharines — St Catharines opted in — the town of Durham, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and Windsor. I'd like to read just a couple of lines from a letter from the mayor of Kingston to Minister Harnick. It said:

"During your remarks, you requested municipalities within the Kingston and Napanee area consider submitting proposals to your ministry to become partners in the Provincial Offences Act. This is very good news for our community, and the city of Kingston is prepared to become a partner with your ministry immediately." It goes on, "I've asked my staff to begin the process of communicating with your ministry staff."

1540

Mr Gerretsen: I'm very pleased to join in this debate. First of all, to take up the comments just made by the last member, yes, in Kingston they have been asking for this for quite some time because it happens to be one of those communities that is well able to look after this. They've got their own solicitor staff within the Kingston city hall framework etc and it does make sense in that particular case. There are many communities throughout the province, however, where it does not make sense, particularly the smaller communities.

Councillor Judy Casselman from St Catharines is here to listen to this debate, and I'm sure her mother, Audrey Dingwall in Kingston, is listening to this debate as well, because these people want to know about the totality of what this government is doing. They want to know not only about some of the good things the government may be doing from time to time for some municipalities, but also with respect to the total downloading that's taking place.

Let's not forget that even on such a simple matter as this, there seems to be a great debate as to how much municipalities are actually going to be making on this. According to the government's own figures, they say turning over the provincial offences revenues to municipalities is going to be \$65 million to the good, as far as municipalities are concerned. It's interesting that the Crombie commission only estimates it to be \$30 million. We want to know who is right.

The reason these figures are so important is that the \$65 million has been used as a justification by the government to download all these social and health care services. It's part of the figure they're using to offset the education taxes. It's very important for the taxpayers of Ontario to know whether \$65 million is the right figure, as the government has stated, or the \$30 million as the Crombie commission has stated.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): The member for St Catharines will be happy to know that I was listening to his speech in my office and deliberately came over to say to him and to this place that the downloading issue is the issue around this particular bill. He is quite right about that.

We would not see in a crowded agenda like the agenda of this government a bill like this, which is a permissive bill, coming forward when we are already sitting in extraordinary session unless this were a key component

to the download this government is planning. It is absolutely key that this be there as a sop to the municipalities, which know very well that they are getting burdened with far more than appears on the surface in terms of the so-called wash that the government talks about. It wouldn't even be a so-called wash in their figures without the \$65 million predicted from this bill.

It's very important that people understand that while this bill in and of itself may not be that offensive, it is offensive within the context of what this government is trying to accomplish in this extraordinary session, and it needs to be seen in that context. There is nothing urgent about this bill except the government's need to try and make that balance sheet look a little bit more credible. The reality is that it isn't credible in the first place. The amount of money that municipalities are promised as a result of this bill I think is highly overextended in terms of the predictions that have been made about the download.

I know there are those who may think that talking about the downloading has nothing to do with this bill. It is extremely important, as the member for St Catharines pointed out, that it is the key to this bill.

The Acting Speaker: The member for St Catharines has two minutes to respond.

Mr Bradley: I appreciate all the comments that have come forward. Some I agree with more than others, particularly the last comment; the others less so.

I want to say to you, not only was I thinking this bill wouldn't be before us, I was thinking that the transportation bill would be before us. I remember that with great fanfare, after all kinds of pressure from the opposition and wheels flying left and right and centre, the Minister of Transportation was going to bring in this bill to deal with the trucking companies, with the safety.

Mrs Boyd: I guess the wheels have fallen off.

Mr Bradley: Well, the wheels have fallen off of that because we in the opposition have said: "Look, bring this bill forward. We can postpone some of the other bills. We don't need to pass the bill for the developers." There's a bill they want for the friends of the developers, to give them some money back so they'll be able to go to the Tory fund-raisers and give more money. Municipal people such as Councillor Casselman are going to be concerned about this because you're going to not only dump on her municipality all the responsibilities, but you're going to then say the city cannot even charge development charges in the manner they used to do in the past.

We have been prepared in this House to proceed, I thought last week we would be proceeding, with the bill for safety on the highways. Instead it was a sham, it was just a big public relations sham in the hallways. The minister has no interest in proceeding with that bill, so it is quite acceptable to say "sham."

I as well want to know that Audrey Dingwall of Kingston, no relation to any famous federal minister, would be watching this particular program, would like to know that her daughter is here in the gallery, very interested in what's going on. I can tell you that Councillor Casselman could not be counted as a raving Liberal or socialist. She's a very open-minded person, and I think

she has seen in the debate this afternoon that we should have been proceeding with other legislation and not this bill.

The Acting: Further debate?

Mr Kormos: I appreciate the somewhat liberal attitude the Speaker has displayed over the course of this debate, understanding that we can't debate Bill 108 in isolation of all the legislation and policy that preceded it and accompanies it. That's a caveat, as they say, that we're going to be far-reaching in our understanding of why New Democrats aren't going to be supporting Bill 108, and I'll tell you that right now. Let's make no bones about it.

It is, as I indicated earlier and as we all know, a bill sponsored by the Attorney General. I'm terribly concerned about what's happening in the Ministry of the Attorney General. Here we have a bill that downloads, will have the effect of downloading the cost of prosecuting the Highway Traffic Act perhaps, the Liquor Licence Act perhaps, any other number of provincial offences, downloading the cost of prosecuting those on to the municipality. It appears that not only is the cost of prosecuting it downloaded, but the impression one gets is that the cost of court services during the course of those prosecutions is downloaded as well.

One wonders then where it's even a matter of transferring responsibility, because this Ministry of the Attorney General, as you know, abandoned provincial judges just a few weeks ago when it said it wasn't going to recognize the independent body that made recommendations as to provincial judges' salaries. It similarly has abandoned justices of the peace, the front-line judiciary, who are a competent and hardworking group of people. It's abandoned them because it's left them out in the cold, hasn't followed up on some of the groundwork that was laid with respect to a structure for justices of the peace. It's a government as well that has abandoned the criminal justice system, to the great pleasure, I tell you, of not just scofflaws but outright criminals.

It's been months now that this government has been warned about the backlog in our criminal courts and about the inevitability of Askov and Melo applications being made. It was warned; it was put on notice, it did nothing, it chose to ignore the warnings presented to it, and lo and behold, we've witnessed members of the bench using Askov to dismiss, in the recent past, some very serious charges where justice will never be done, from any number of persons' points of view, because the Attorney General — I suppose we shouldn't be overly surprised.

The Ministry of the Attorney General and the Attorney General, that's where the buck stops. He mismanaged; please, he mismanaged the family support plan. It goes beyond mismanagement. It was the height of incompetence, it was bungling, it was cruel to the women and children who depended upon him, as the Attorney General, to ensure that they received the payments that were being made by their spouses or former spouses for the support of themselves and their children.

1550

You know what happened, Speaker. The Attorney General shut down eight regional offices of the family

support plan. He terminated some 290-plus employees, experienced staff people. Then he stood in this House day after day, as members of the opposition caucuses, and certainly New Democrats, presented him with question after question about why it was that this person in this community and this woman in this community and that woman and her children in that community all of a sudden, come fall 1996, weren't getting the family support cheques they were entitled to.

This is where the mega-stuff comes in. He created a mega-plan. Now that we know what his mega-plan consisted of, we have every reason to doubt anything mega that comes out of this government. We're going to talk about megacity in just a little bit. As a matter of fact, we're going to talk about the presentation over at the Bluma Appel Theatre last Sunday night by Toronto Artists for Democracy and some of the things that were said there and some of the presentations that were made to a packed house at that theatre here in the city of Toronto.

We've got, among other things, two senior, highly regarded, well-respected jurists in this province, one known to all of us, Chief Justice McMurtry, and Chief Justice LeSage, both of them telling this government in no uncertain terms — they aren't beating around the bush — that this government's failure, and very specifically telling the Attorney General he's the one responsible, that the Attorney General's incompetence with respect to the functioning of our courts is creating backlogs in the criminal justice system that are going to result in charges being stayed or turfed by virtue of the application of Askov, and in civil matters are going to cause grief, hardship and costs to civil litigants, little people who are trying to access the courts to obtain some redress for a wrong done to them or collect some money that's owed to them or make sure that a home repair contract that was fouled up is remedied.

Let me tell you what Chief Justice McMurtry said. He said, "While lipservice is being paid within the ranks of government to the importance of the justice system, the priorities are elsewhere when it actually comes to allocating funds." That's what Chief Justice McMurtry said. Justice LeSage echoed that, indicating essentially that a shortage of funds is backlogging both the civil and criminal justice systems. It's not the first time these two jurists have taken this government to task. They did it back in February 1996. Justice McMurtry talked about the prospect of civil chaos and perhaps even violence. I tell you, he's a very cautious person. He's not inclined to make off-the-cuff kinds of comments.

How does the Ministry of the Attorney General respond? Here we have two senior, respected judges telling the Attorney General that all hell's going to break loose in our courts, in our civil and criminal justice systems. What does a source within the Ministry of the Attorney General say about these judges? I'm going to tell you. This is a quote. This is what the Ministry of the Attorney General said about these two distinguished judges: "All they have to do is burp, fart or belch and it's on the front page. I think they believe they are trying to help, but they aren't." The same spokesperson for the ministry goes further and says, "I have three words for what the chief justices are doing: 'Out of touch.'"

Speaking of being out of touch, Speaker, I think a few more members should be in touch, at least in sufficient numbers to constitute a quorum.

The Acting Speaker: Would the table check for a quorum, please.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller): A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: Thank you kindly, Speaker. The Ministry of the Attorney General is treating two of our most senior justices with outright contempt. That's a very troubling thing coming directly from the Attorney General's ministry, an incredibly troubling thing. Clearly the Attorney General doesn't have a handle on things. There is no control. He simply doesn't care or is disinclined to express or exercise any interest in what's happening in our courts, no more so than he was inclined to express any interest in what was happening up in Downsview in the family support plan office.

You know what happened there. Shelley Martel, the member for Sudbury East, and I, after hearing the Attorney General day after day after day tell us that these cases after cases after cases were but glitches in his grand mega-FSP, took a ride up to Downsview with a video camera. What we found was an office that was in total chaos, was still in packing crates. We found confidential files in unsealed boxes in public hallways to which anybody — and we did have access; the most egregious breach of any sense of responsibility. The Attorney General clearly blew it; he didn't have a handle on that either.

Also, you know Judge Derek Hogg over in the Etobicoke court, a provincial judge, just the other day raised again his concern about the incredible backlogs — as I say, he's out in Etobicoke; they have incredible backlogs there — and the risk of cases never coming to trial, being stayed or turfed out because of undue delay. Again, it's something that falls firmly at the feet of the Attorney General.

We can't trust him to run the criminal justice system; he's demonstrated that. We can't trust him to supervise the civil justice system; he's demonstrated that. His incompetence is so prevailing that we can't trust him to run the family support plan; he's demonstrated that.

How, then, can we trust him when he presents Bill 108 and describes it as an act to reduce duplication and streamline administration? How can we trust him to do that? It's short title is Streamlining of Administration of Provincial Offences Act. It's horse feathers. It has nothing to do with streamlining; it has to do very much with downloading the cost and responsibility for prosecuting on to municipalities. This government has no intention of clearing up the backlogs in our criminal courts. It talks a big game when it comes to protecting people from criminals, it talks a real big game, but it just doesn't deliver.

1600

Oh, there's all the talk in the world about mega-jails and boot camps. One day they're boot camps and the

next day they're not, but at the end of the day it's still the same proposition — absolute failures in the United States, absolute failures. They do nothing to reduce the rate of repeat offences. They've been proven to be schools for criminals, breeding grounds for crime, for young and old inmates alike. They're absolute failures in the United States, all the more so when run by the private sector, which is what this government proposes to do.

They talk a big game about protecting communities. They didn't protect women and their children who have relied upon their former spouses' support cheques to carry them through all the seasons, to carry them through Christmastime and through the coldest season of the year. They were getting eviction notice after eviction notice and they were having their utilities cut off, hydro and gas, and they were losing their telephone services and they were going with no groceries and the kids weren't getting winter boots because the Attorney General was holding on to the money that was being paid into the system by their spouses.

We're not talking hundreds and thousands, we're talking literally millions of dollars and thousands of kids who tramped through slushy, winter streets in ragged, holey sneakers when they should have been wearing boots. The Attorney General's inability, his incompetence in the administration of the family support plan left those kids without those winter boots that the support money would have permitted them to have.

Here we've got Bill 108. Here we've got a Ministry of the Attorney General that speaks in such a flippant way about chief justices: "All they have to do is burp, fart or belch and it's on the front page." It goes on to say that they're "out of touch." Out of touch, my foot. This government's out of touch. If you want to pick a single minister who's out in orbit, the Attorney General is it. People know it, and they know it in increasing numbers.

Look at the rallying. Look at the mobilization of people. I know there have been megacity meetings. I've sat in from time to time, when I've been able to, on Bill 103 megacity hearings to listen to the presentations made. I don't know where the support is for this government's agenda. It's not from the people coming forward to any of these committees. I've sat there patiently saying, "I'm waiting for maybe one presenter, other than the Premier's ex-chauffeur, who supports this agenda." Once again, it's like Diogenes with the lamp; he simply couldn't find one. We're not going to find one among this government's ranks. I couldn't find support for the government's agenda.

I was over last Sunday night to the Bluma Appel Theatre at the St Lawrence Centre. Toronto Artists for Democracy, an ad hoc group thrown together very quickly, put on a wonderful concert. There were poets there, singers, songwriters, playwrights, actors, actresses. There was a great performance by Linda Griffiths, and Nancy White was there. You know Nancy White, the great satirical singer; she's from the east coast. She did the sort of stuff that Nancy White does best. June Callwood was there, and she was described there as Canada's most compassionate woman and probably one of the most intelligent as well. She spoke. Thomson Highway, Atom Egoyan, and a great pair of poets, Shafik, people like

Salome Bey and the Barenaked Ladies were there. That's a musical group, Speaker. The Barenaked Ladies were there, but just half of them, and Moxy Früvous were there — great political, satirical singer-songwriters. There was a poem by Bob Priest, who's a well-known Toronto poet, that was put to song. It was called Free Ontario, and they sang it there.

Mr Bill Grimmett (Muskoka-Georgian Bay): Why don't you sing it for us?

Mr Kormos: The poem? I will. The poem went like this, and they performed this. They said:

We're gonna clean out the Eves, chase off the thieves,
tell Mike Harris where to go.

We're gonna flush 'em down the drain,
pull the Leach from our veins, and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
and Mike keeps Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dopes back to the slopes,
and free Ontario.

And when we kick out their butts, we'll cut all the cuts,
just tell them, megacity, no.

We're going to break off our chains,
pull the Leach from our veins, and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
they all keep Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dinks back to the links,
and free Ontario.

That was Robert Priest, a poem by a Toronto poet that was put to music, and I very much wanted to put that on the record here at the Legislature.

I think it's important that some of my colleagues understand what people are saying out there, what the sentiments are that are being expressed. They were looking to free Ontario. They're gonna send all those dopes back to the slopes and free Ontario. "We're gonna send all those dinks back to the links and free Ontario."

I was moved by that. I felt the passion of the poet while that song was being sung. As a matter of fact, first Robert Priest sang it — I suppose he's a poet-singer — and then an ensemble, the choir on bikes, sang it, along with Stop Amalgamation. It was a great concert. I wish you had been there. I would have been able to get you a ticket and you would have been more than welcome. I don't think you would have been breaching any of your independence or violating any of the standards that are imposed on you as a Speaker by having gone there.

I would have loved to have the Attorney General there. I suspect he wasn't spending his Sunday night worrying about the overcrowded courts. He was probably more worried about how he could create a leaked, non-attributed statement out of his office dumping all over two senior jurists and referring to them as "out of touch." That's his idea of spin control. That's it. That's as good as it gets, to have an unnamed source from within the Ministry of the Attorney General. I think I know who it is too, quite frankly. I think I know who it is. Enough said, but I'm pretty sure I know who it is, because they don't have much variety over there. They use the same hack to keep doing this sort of spin, if you can call it spin doctoring by any stretch of the imagination.

It was interesting, because here we have the megacity issue, and again it's no coincidence that megacity is

happening at the same time as all the downloading; dumping, if you will. It's the Harris dump on the people of Ontario. Harris is taking a dump on the people of Ontario. He's dumping on to them costs and expenses that were never meant to be in the realm of municipalities, relieving the province of those obligations and dumping them on to property taxpayers. People who are fighting the megacity know that. The people who were up at the Toronto Artists for Democracy presentation over at the Bluma Appel Theatre last Sunday know that too.

I'll tell you who else knows it, Speaker. I was in St Catharines last night over at the CAW Local 199 hall on Bunting Road. As a matter of fact, I've been invited there along with every other MPP from Niagara. There are six of us now, of course. With the anti-democratization of the Legislature by this government, there are only going to be four MPPs representing the regional municipality of Niagara. So all six MPPs had been invited by the Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association to meet with them and their members, teachers from the English Catholic schools in Lincoln — that's Niagara north — over at the Canadian Auto Workers hall, Local 199. I had been invited; the member for St Catharines, Mr Bradley, had been invited; the member from down in southern Niagara, Mr Hudak, had been invited; the member for Niagara Falls, Mr Maves, had been invited; the member for Lincoln, Mr Sheehan, had been invited; and the member for St Catharines-Brock, Mr Froese, had been invited.

1610

The member for St Catharines knew I was going to go down there and I know I left before he did, but he got there before I did. I don't know how that happened. Maybe that's a provincial offences issue in its own right. I hit some bad traffic, and he clearly had smooth sailing. But the member for St Catharines was there. He had no difficulty getting from the Legislature down to meet with teachers. They are constituents, after all. I didn't have that much trouble getting out of the Legislature and going down to meet with teachers. They are my constituents, and I am concerned about what happens to them and I'm interested in what they've got to say. Who wouldn't be?

I appreciate that one, maybe even two or possibly even three of the other four members, the government members, may not have been able to get there — they might have had pressing duties here at Queen's Park — but none of the four was able to get there. They were conspicuous by their absence, conspicuous, I say.

Here we are. It's part and parcel of what's happening in the Harris dump on to municipalities and municipal taxpayers, part and parcel of the megacity, part and parcel of Bill 104 as well, which is "The Defunding of Education in the Province of Ontario Act." That's what it is. It's the gutting of public education here in Ontario.

I tell you — and this is one of the things I wanted to raise with the Catholic teachers at that meeting last night — it also could well be the back-door attack on Catholic education in the province. Bill 104 has basically neutered, nullified any of the significance of local boards of education, and in any event, has made them so big that local boards of education have no control whatsoever. They're but rubber stamps for the Minister of Education and, more significantly, the backroom gang in the Ministry of Education that's going to call the shots.

The process of defunding — that's what Bill 104 does — public education in Ontario, be it Catholic or non-Catholic, is a devastating attack on our children and on our young people. Although Bill 104 impacts on what historically and traditionally were locally controlled and primarily locally funded forms of education, colleges and universities are under attack too. If you don't think they are, pay closer attention.

I'm looking for the Common Sense Revolution. It's a slippery little thing; it slides all over the place. Revolutions are like that. This government wants to turn the clock back 40 years. In the Common Sense Revolution alone, the fact was bemoaned that students pay such a small percentage, by way of tuition, of their cost of education at the university. It bemoans that fact and refers to the good old days back in the 1950s when the percentage paid by students was much higher than now.

You see, I remember the good old days, only they weren't so good for working people and their children when it came to university education, because those good old days that the Tories hanker after were days when the children of working families didn't get a chance to go to college or university. They simply didn't. There was no room for them in our colleges and universities. There wasn't. Colleges and universities were the enclave of the children of the very rich. If you were a paperworker down in Thorold, it was but a dream to think of your kid going to university, if your kid was university age in 1950, 1951, 1952 — the good old days, as the Tories would speak of them.

We've got folks here from Thorold right now. I've got Mayor Mal Woodhouse from Thorold and some of his staff. They know what I'm talking about. They remember the "good old days," when workers had six-day work-weeks and when there were no pension plans and when social assistance was called relief and it was controlled by the city administrator, who could arbitrarily decide who was eligible and who wasn't. They're not quite old enough, but they may have recalled their parents talk about the "good old days" when the straw boss at the factory needed a bottle of whisky a week or a little bit of your paycheque if he was going to give you a job that week, or he wanted your wife or your daughter. Don't tell me that didn't happen. That happened. Those were the "good old days."

Well, working people didn't think they were that good. Working people, people who worked in the paper mills of Thorold or in the steel mills of Welland, yes, and the car plants of St Catharines, said, "No, these aren't the sort of good things I want for my children." Working people — and a lot of them are old folks now; some of them are gone — understood that it was important to work together, to work, dare I say it, collectively. They understood that it was important to build public things that were owned by the whole community, and they did.

Those hospitals down in Niagara that this gang wants to shut down, the Hotel Dieu or the Port Colborne General or Lincoln's hospital, don't belong to this government to shut down. They belong to the people of those communities. It's the working people of those communities and their parents and their parents before them who built those hospitals brick by brick and paid

for them dollar by dollar with subscriptions off their paycheques and with their tax dollars, who did it because they remember the days before public health care. They remember not being able to take their kids to a doctor because they simply didn't have the money and they remember the tragedies that flowed from kids who weren't treated adequately or in time. They remember.

Down where I come from, there's a whole lot of families from southern and eastern Europe, back from the 1930s and 1940s and into the 1950s, and now we've got people from all over the world coming into Niagara. But those people who came from southern Europe or from eastern Europe as often as not came to this country with no education, none whatsoever, came from tiny villages in Calabria or Abruzzi or from places like where my grandparents came from, in eastern Slovakia, or the Ukraine or Poland or any number of countries. Any number of them came here with literally no education.

They came here only with hearsay, third-party information about what they were expecting to find. They found of course that the streets weren't lined with gold, but they worked and they organized themselves and they built communities and they built public things, they built public hospitals and they built public schools, and yes, they built universities.

You listen from time to time — I know you do — to the Minister of Education; from time to time is more than sufficient. But you listen to the Minister of Education from time to time and you hear him talk about the number of reports on education. I happen to remember — and again I won't mince words — it was a real Progressive Conservative government, several decades ago now, that broke the barriers to universities and colleges. That's when you saw universities like York University and Brock University in St Catharines being built. Universities were being opened to children of working families in a way that they weren't ever before. That's when you saw the growth, in the late 1960s, the mid-1960s, of community colleges. Mayor Woodhouse knows a lot about community colleges. That's when you saw this incredible growth that was designed to make post-secondary education accessible to everybody.

1620

Did it require an investment of money? Of course it did. Were our parents and grandparents more than pleased to invest that money? Of course they were, because they knew what it meant for their children and maybe even more importantly for their grandchildren.

These are the same colleges and universities that this government has every intention of turning once again into elite schools for the children of only the very wealthy. You heard the Minister of Education say it. He complained, "We've got too many overeducated young people." What a dumb thing to say, an absolutely dumb thing to say. We still don't rank very well internationally when it comes to literacy. We don't stand very well when it comes to retention, that is, the number of kids who stay in high school long enough to graduate. Yet this government wants to start turning the clock back.

I was up at York University with David Artemiw, a first year student and a student activist up at York. He was one of the people, under the leadership of the York

Federation of Students, the YFS, who, I think it was on February 9, began the occupation of the president's office. They were in there for five or six days, around the clock, and they brought attention to the fact that this government doesn't want David Artemiw in university, or others like him. This government simply doesn't want David Artemiw in university, doesn't think he deserves or is deserving of a university education.

This government is forcing up tuition rates to the point where the David Artemiws of Ontario simply won't be able to afford, simply won't have access to, university. It doesn't want David Artemiw to be well educated. It doesn't want to see a well-educated, highly skilled workforce, because that isn't in tune or consistent with this government's goal of creating a low-wage economy. That's very much a part of this goal, the creation of a low-wage economy.

I'll tell you this, I'm proud of the students who mobilized and organized and took on this government in the offices of the president of York University. I was proud to go there and speak with them around a week and a half ago, where they were rallied in their rotunda. I was proud of them. I explained to them that students historically and internationally have been at the leading edge of social change.

As the students mobilize and gather in larger and larger numbers at York, as they are in Guelph and in Ottawa and in downtown Toronto and in Windsor, across this province, and as they speak with fellow students about what this government has in mind for them, I'm convinced their numbers are going to grow and that movement is going to overflow the boundaries of the university campuses and infiltrate communities across this province.

Let me talk to their parents, because their parents are the ones who had dreams for their children. Their parents are the ones who did without, who sacrificed, who forewent vacations and holidays and restaurant meals hoping that their kids were going to have a university education that maybe they didn't, and maybe enjoy a little bit of the wealth and affluence and prosperity that indeed exists here in this province but — you talk about trickle down — doesn't seem to be trickling down very well at all.

And jobs? The sad reality is, as David Artemiw knows — Larry Savage from Brock University is here too and he knows — there are more jobless people in this province today than there were a year ago. That's what Mike Harris and the Tory regime have done for workers in this province. Unemployment is higher than it was a year ago, and unemployment among young people is, I tell you, double what it is for their parents.

Would these young people love to be able to work to help support themselves through their university or college educations? Of course they would. But you see, the jobs that students used to do are now being done by their parents: the Wal-Mart jobs, the McDonald's jobs. Go there. The jobs that young people used to do on weekends and in the evenings and during the summer are now being done by their parents, who have been forced out of their workplaces or who are retired and can no longer rely on their modest pensions for a decent retire-

ment and at the ages of 65 and 70 — yes, 70 — are forced to take on low-wage jobs with the parasites like Wal-Mart. Those jobs aren't there for students any more. They simply aren't there for the students. The jobs that students used to do are being performed now by their parents.

Let's understand that in this government's drive for lower and lower wages — I've got to tell you for just a minute. I've told you before. Stelpipe, Page-Hersey down in Welland is still on strike. It's been since November of last year. All those workers are looking for is a little bit of parity, something akin to parity with other Stelco employees in other Stelco divisions when it comes to pensions, and they'd like to have something more akin to parity when it comes to wages too. They've made a lot of money for Stelco-Stelpipe, Page-Hersey over the years; they've made a lot of money for these guys. They've been out on the sidewalks, hitting the bricks, for months now. But you know, every Friday night there's a dinner over at the CAW hall — it used to be the United Electrical Workers hall — over on Steel Street down the south end of Welland, just behind Mark Evans's law office at the end of King Street, where King Street meets Ontario Road. Each week a different group, including retailers, sponsors the dinner, provides the food.

On the wall of the CAW hall is a list of all the small businesses from Welland who have supported the strike. You see, business people in Welland understand that without labour unions and without strong workers' organizations and without decent wages, small business is doomed. Small business people in Welland, whether it's the book exchange down at the south end of King Street or Marg McPherson's For the Love of Books up at the north end of King Street, know that if workers aren't making decent wages, they're not selling their wares, they're simply not selling their wares. You take a look at the wall of the CAW hall and you see the small business and their support.

Bill 108 is relevant, as this is relevant to Bill 108. Just the other week some real estate agents and salespeople — Helen Brown, from Helen Brown Real Estate, organized them, because Helen Brown said: "Darn it, these workers buy and sell their houses. Why shouldn't real estate people be supporting these workers when they need their help?" Helen Brown organized a collection — she did — of real estate agents and they went down there and supported the Stelco-Stelpipe, Page-Hersey workers by sitting in on their Friday evening dinner. She's going to keep doing it and she's going to keep doing it again.

One of the problems we're witnessing down in Niagara is things like the privatization and shutdown of the Niagara Detention Centre. That's why the mayor of Thorold is here, because he's concerned about it and the jobs being lost as a result of this government's disdain for efficient and modern detention centres, like the Niagara Detention Centre is. Total disdain is what this government has. This government's shutting down workplaces and it's also killing jobs. Taxfighter, my foot; Jobkiller is more like it.

1630

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: They seem to be shutting down this workplace as well. We do not have a quorum.

The Acting Speaker: Would the table check for a quorum, please.

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex D. McFedries): A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold again.

Mr Kormos: During the course of Bill 108 we've got to be careful not to isolate it, not to take it outside the perspective.

The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale — were you here, Speaker, when I read the correspondence he sent to one of his constituents? His constituents had written to him condemning Bill 103 and megacity and saying they wanted nothing to do with it, and that they thought it was the most evil proposition that could ever be encountered. What does the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale write back? "Thank you very much for your support for the government's Bill 103." He signed it. I've got the letter. I warned these people that they're liable to end up on his fund-raising list.

That happens from time to time. Where's he from? What's his name? James Flaherty from Durham Centre. The member for Durham Centre did that. He did that with some folks from Niagara Falls who appeared at the slot machine hearings down in Fort Erie. They appeared there condemning it, and then she gets a letter asking her to donate money to the Conservative Party of Ontario.

Well, not on a bad day or a good day either — please. Besides, these guys got money. They've got it coming out of their ying-yangs. You know that. The corporate world's going to finance all the third-party ad campaigns these guys want because they're doing their bidding. That's why they're opening the door to privatization of firefighting. We know that. Firefighters know that.

Mike Harris promised firefighters — and this was on videotape too. I've got to confess neither Shelley Martel, the member for Sudbury East, or I had anything to do with that videotape. As matter of fact, silly goose, I think he made it himself. Boy, dumb or dumber?

The Premier made the videotape himself promising firefighters that there wouldn't be any changes to firefighting legislation without thorough consultation with them. The Premier put it on videotape. Holy zonkers. Because, sure enough, he used that videotape and he used firefighters during the course of the election campaign to get elected. He distributed the videotape.

We've got Bill 84, which is as distinct and pointed an attack on professional firefighting as could ever be launched. The firefighters were here the other day. You were here on Monday, Speaker, you saw them. They filled the gallery, firefighters from across southern Ontario. There were folks here from Welland, Hamilton, Stoney Creek, from every municipality in the Toronto and greater Toronto area. All looking squarely at the Premier with distrust in their eyes and fear about what the Premier of this province is going to do to professional firefighting because he's proposing to permit it to be privatized.

"Impossible," you say. I've had people — because I've made that proposition to you, as firefighters have — say:

"What do you mean 'privatize'? How do you privatize firefighting?" People say: "No, please. Most of the other stuff you say we're on side with, but we can't buy into privatizing. How can you privatize? It's impossible."

Our good friends — well, really, their good friends from Rural/Metro that they've permitted to buy up ambulance services here in the province of Ontario, that American company that wants to do ambulance service American style right here in Ontario, big city and small town alike, they were over at the city of Waterloo talking to the CAO of that city just a few weeks ago making their pitch to privatize Waterloo's firefighting services.

Why do they do it? They do it because of the big profits they can make. How do they do it? They do it by imposing workweeks for firefighters of up to 66 hours, they do it by paying minimum wage or only slightly better and they do it by charging households to whom they bring their firefighting services.

We had news reports from down near Phoenix, Arizona, where Rural/Metro is right in the swing of things, right in the game. I read to you, Speaker, the news report of one woman who stood there and watched her house burn because Rural/Metro only had three and a half minutes of water in their pumper truck. That was it: Three and a half minutes and it was gone. They still billed her \$13,000.

Another homeowner watched the fire truck break down in front of their house while the flames were roaring through the roof, watched their house burn down while the tow-truck came to tow Rural/Metro's private fire truck away from the scene. They were billed too. That's what privatized firefighting services mean.

This government is inviting, embracing — this government is engaged right now in an orgy of privatization. Its impact on Canadian communities and Ontario communities is going to be significant. The people who are prepared to make the big profits — you heard Mr Bradley, the member for St Catharines, talk about me having said it last night at OECTA, Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association, down in St Catharines, CAW Local 199 hall on Bunting Road — they're lined up at the Peace Bridge a mile long and three wide, American operators, to take over public institutions and public services that Ontarians built and paid for and that are being confiscated, that are being, quite frankly, stolen from Ontario's municipalities by this government that's far more beholden to its American-based corporate friends than it ever will be to taxpayers and residents of Ontario.

Speaker, do I detect the absence of a quorum? I see a minion running to haul them out of the back rooms. Let's halt the quorum call and see if we can drag some of these — let's not embarrass them with another quorum call. I'll just mention the fact that there isn't a quorum, but, please, I'm not raising a quorum. I just want to see if the people are hauling those people in. If anybody's got food stains on their tie, don't be embarrassed. Here we are waiting for them.

I don't know, Speaker, do you think there's a quorum yet? Come on, guys, we're trying to avoid the embarrassment of a quorum call. How are we doing? Is this it? Is this as good as we get? I'll carry on and give them a

couple more minutes, see if they can get their act together.

This is the sort of incompetence that destroyed the family support plan and that's creating lineups in our courtrooms that are setting criminals free.

1640

What exactly does the government have in mind with Bill 108? Is it what it appears to be? The government's going to download the prosecution of — I can see there's some logic, some common sense. Lord knows I don't see much of it around here, but there was some to having municipalities prosecute parking tickets, of course, because inevitably it was municipal bylaws officers who handed the tickets out.

I talked to some provincial prosecutors — not a crown attorney, but one of those people who do the provincial prosecutions. Talk about people who perform much of the same job as crown attorneys and are as bright as any crown attorney I ever knew and as hardworking as any crown attorney I ever knew and as vigorous. Listen, you get cross-examined by Anne Swayze down in Welland some day and you know what a vigorous cross-examination is, but they're paid far less than crown attorneys are.

Here they are being sloughed off, being told to prosecute stuff that's — this is what's so weird about this legislation, because the agreement is going to designate certain stuff to be the responsibility of the municipality to prosecute. One of the problems in regional Niagara is that the municipality is the regional municipality of Niagara, but we have judicial districts of Niagara north and Niagara south. It's going to be a little interesting.

Mind you, municipalities like the city of Welland, the city of Thorold, the city of Niagara Falls each have their own bylaws officers who prosecute bylaws. The real hook here — the lure rather — is the proposition that cities might be able to keep the fines that are levied. What dirty dogs these people must be to politicize the criminal justice system like that. Look at the pressures that are going to be on — well, think about it. I've got a feeling that part of the deal is paying for the justice of the peace as well.

There might be some other people in this room who are familiar with the prospect of JP shopping. There are some JPs who will do it; there are some JPs who just won't. I'm told — this may not be true; this might be apocryphal — that there are some JPs who aren't as ready to grant a search warrant. They're a little more rigid in the standards they impose on police officers applying for them. But there's a payback time. When the staff sergeant or the inspector wants a JP to come in to sign a bunch of informations for which the JP, if he or she is not a salaried JP, gets a buck a piece, it's inevitably the JP who tends to be somewhat more favourable — and this doesn't happen everywhere or all the time — to the investigating officers when they want a search warrant on, let's say, an informant who is unnamed but otherwise known as a reliable informant. Those are the sort of informations that search warrants from time to time are given on, which are held with some scepticism by some people in the criminal justice system.

I can see here a municipality, for instance, leaning in ever-so-subtle ways. Most JPs, all of them, wouldn't want

to be leaned on and would want to be strong in their resistance to this sort of pressure, but there are ways of getting to people. We shouldn't even be assisting in creating a scenario where that can even be possible. There's going to be pressure on municipalities, for instance, because this contemplates municipalities prosecuting Highway Traffic Act speeding offences. The kickback, according to the government — and who can believe them any more? — for the municipality is going to be that it gets to keep the fine.

Why I speak about this is the politicization of the criminal justice system. You've already heard comments about this. You heard it from the member for St Catharines. I'll echo them because I share his views on this. You're talking about the Boss Hogg type of policing and about the sort of stuff that — we've talked so many times about how Mike Harris and his gang — what was it they called them, his gang of dinks being sent back to the links. That's what the poem says, "We're going to send all those dinks back to the links, and free Ontario."

Mike Harris and his gang are Americanizing this great province, turning it into the Mississippi or the Alabama of the north. I was struck by the reference of the member for St Catharines, Mr Bradley, to the all-so-common American speed trap down in the south. I've got nothing against the south or Americans or southerners. The fact is it's a reality, because of the nature of financing some of those communities, that yes, they've got speed traps and police have been politicized. What's going to happen if there's pressure on police to be out there with limited and scarce resources is that again we're facing the prospect of privatized police.

This government has already generated privatization of policing. In the city of St Catharines, along Ontario Street there is a business strip that has felt compelled — no criticism of the Niagara Regional Police, but just understand that the resources being made available to the Niagara Regional Police are so limited they can't adequately patrol that commercial strip along Ontario Street. There are a lot of car dealerships. There have been incidents of vandalism, that sort of thing. So they hired a private policing firm.

That's what the privatization of policing is all about and this government, as much as it's opening the door to privatized firefighting services, is opening the door to the privatization of policing.

We're talking here about a bill that, yes, had a great risk of politicizing the police, politicizing our criminal justice system, politicizing the provincial prosecutors, politicizing the courts, and I don't like the prospect of it at all, at all, at all.

The other question is, this government doesn't make a deal. This government talks about partnerships, partnerships with municipalities. Municipalities aren't partners of this government; they're hostages of this government. They've got no choice. They're having a number done on them.

Let me tell you what's happening in regional Niagara alone. The downloading, the Harris dump on Niagara, is going to create a shortfall of \$73 million. In other words, taxes for regional Niagara are going to have to go up by the tune of at least \$73 million. That's over 400 bucks a

household, sir. For the seniors I know, that's an awful lot of money; for the young families I know, that's an awful lot of money; for the single mothers I know, that's an awful lot of money; and for the hardworking women and men I know in Niagara and Welland-Thorold and through Pelham and across the region, that's an awful lot of money.

I'll tell you what that dump is going to mean. It's going to mean that seniors are going to lose their homes. I know it. But then where do they go to? To 211 King Street. That's social housing. It's non-profit housing and it's a wonderful complex. It's beautiful, right on King Street in Welland, across from the Welland Flower Shop. It faces on to King Street, but then the back of the building looks over the old Welland Canal.

It's a beautiful location, right in downtown Welland and the apartments are small square footage, designed for seniors and easy to maintain. There's a social room and a rec room and there are all sorts of activities that go on in the building. I can't think of a senior who has moved there who hasn't enjoyed it and who hasn't found some dignity and companionship and a decent lifestyle in his or her senior years.

The waiting list, I tell you, is long, and this government, Mike Harris and his cohorts, have abandoned 211 King Street in Welland. They're going to shut her down. Another selloff to their corporate friends who will pick it up, oh, in a New York minute and who will charge rents as much as the market can bear, because don't forget this is the government that took away rent control.

1650

Those seniors, I'll tell you, people like Oral Blackbeard — she died a few weeks ago. She had lived at 211 King Street for a good chunk of time until she had to go into the hospital, and thank God she went into the hospital when she did, because if she had fallen sick now, she'd probably be sitting in a hallway and suffering the indignity of that. She had to go into the hospital a few years ago, and back then hospitals were still being sufficiently and adequately funded that they had space for her. Oral Blackbeard, she died a good age. She had a lot of decades under her belt and got to see her grandkids grown up, and great-grandkids to boot, from out in Xela, Saskatchewan, down in the southeast. I visited the town. It's sort of a ghost town now because it no longer exists. But she came down here during the war when women came down to work in places like some of the steel mills and in cotton mills, in war production. Women like Oral, oh yes, they worked.

She was a believer in public institutions. She believed in 211 King Street. She understood that the rents there were moderate and affordable because there was a level of subsidization. I know that too, and every taxpayer in the city of Welland knows it and every taxpayer in the city of Welland feels proud of buildings like 211 King Street, because it's going to be their parents and then them who are going to be lined up after maybe their spouse has to be hospitalized or passes on. It's going to be them lined up looking for affordable, clean, decent, warm, comfortable and sociable accommodations in social housing like 211 King Street.

This government doesn't care about the people who live in 211 King Street. This government is prepared to

put them out on the street. They're prepared to put them in cardboard packing boxes, living in alleyways. If you think the folks aren't doing that, take a walk. Come take a walk with me, and we can talk to some seniors on the street, huddled under scraps of blankets, trying to protect themselves from the cold, seniors abandoned by this government and its policies. I tell you, the numbers are going to increase in ways that our worst nightmares never anticipated.

Again, if you think this is some sort of fiction, come take a walk with me. We'll go to any number of hostels operated out of church halls, and they're makeshift hostels. They don't have showers. They don't have tubs. They don't have enough washroom facilities. People can't clean up. Some of them are day hostels and some are night hostels. Come take a walk with me, Speaker. We won't have to walk far, we won't have to walk long, to talk to some of the old folks out in the cold this winter here in Toronto, the ones who survived, because a few have their lives taken by the cold, and I suppose the loneliness and the tragedy of a government that simply doesn't care about old people, nor about poor people, nor, increasingly so, about the sick.

One wonders why the act, Bill 108, wouldn't have been more specific about which offences were going to be transferred down to municipalities to prosecute. One would have wondered why the bill wouldn't be more specific about whether municipalities were going to have to pay just for the prosecution. I think inherent in this is making municipalities pick up the tab for courtroom space, for court clerks, for interpreters and translators, the people who record what happens in courts, for the security for courtrooms, be it civilian security, lay security or police security. This isn't about streamlining. Streamlining, my foot. It's about downloading.

Charlie Harnick goofed up, he fouled up miserably, tragically, the family support plan, and now he's leaving another mess behind him in the criminal justice system and he's looking to municipalities, which have already had the big dump done to them, have already had the boots put to them, to pick up some of the tab for a criminal justice system that I tell you is faltering under the guidance — dare we call it that? — of this Attorney General. He's the one whose inner circle says about Justice McMurtry and Justice LeSage, "Oh, they're out of touch." They think that "All they have to do is burp, fart or belch and it's on the front page" of the papers.

That's what the Attorney General says about Chief Justice LeSage and Chief Justice McMurtry.

Mr Gerretsen: That's horrible.

Mr Kormos: It's contemptuous.

Mrs Boyd: And contemptible.

Mr Kormos: And contemptible, as the member for London Centre so appropriately points out. And more so, it's purposeful. You know how these leaks — this isn't a leak. This isn't some malcontent staffer of Mr Harnick. This is a planted comment. These things are planted. You know that. There's all these little spin doctors and minions and worker bees running around here writing up little lines and doing damage control and spin on this and spin on that.

What did we hear from the Minister of Housing today? Wait a minute. This was beautiful, and I hope he didn't contract out for this, but he acknowledged — here he is, he's stuck with it — the No vote is going to be mammoth. Right? So Al — I'm sorry, not Al. Maybe his dog Tory calls him Al, but I certainly can't, least of all here in the Legislature. But the Minister of Housing says, "Yeah, there's going to be a massive No vote, but you see, it's because people are angry about little bits and pieces of stuff that the government's doing all over the place; it's not a real reflection of how people feel about megacity." That's the minister's latest spin on it.

I encouraged him today that if he paid for it on a contract service, he should get his money back, because that's a really bad one, it really is. That one doesn't carry much currency. The press gallery's eyes didn't light up. Because you can watch up here, you can watch the press gallery, and if Christina Blizzard's examining the paintings up on the ceiling there, you know that whatever it is that's being said ain't going to be in her column the next day. And Al Leach was up there saying, "I know there's going to be a massive No vote, but it's got to do with things other than megacity." These people are really expressing their dissatisfaction, I suppose, with the climate or the weather or the level of carbon monoxide in downtown Toronto. Give me a break.

Again, that's the sort of spin doctoring — comments like these, really obnoxious comments, from Mr Harnick's ministry about two respected judges. They aren't accidents; they aren't slips of the tongue. They didn't happen over at the Jack Russell around 11:30 in the evening. It happened during work hours and it was a plant. It was designed to reach the pages of the *Law Times*. At the end of the day, I suppose there's nothing inherently wrong with that, but this is a dumb plant. All it does is once again it cries out and draws attention to the incompetence of the Attorney General.

So we've got an incompetent Attorney General who mucked up — use your imagination, Speaker — mucked up the family support plan, has mucked up big time the criminal justice system and the civil justice system, and who now joins his colleagues in this attack on property taxpayers, looks to municipalities like Welland and like Thorold and like Pelham to pick up the tab for his own incompetence, his own bungling of the criminal justice system. He wants them to start picking up the tab, I'm convinced, for courtrooms, for court staff, for court security, for justices of the peace and clearly for prosecutors.

1700
I'm not going to support that bill. Neither are the members of the New Democratic Party caucus. I've got a feeling, without them saying so specifically, that the Liberals aren't going to support it either. I can't speak for them, but I got the distinct impression that the Liberals aren't going to have nothing to do with this baloney.

Remember that line:

And when we kick out their butts we'll cut all the cuts, just tell them megacity, no.

We're gonna break off our chains,

pull the Leach from our veins and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini, they all keep Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dinks back to the links, and free Ontario."

That's what people are thinking and singing in unison out there across the city of Toronto. That's what they think about this government's downloading.

Let me tell you about the attack on publicly funded education, part and parcel of this. People in Ontario are prepared to invest in a criminal justice system if indeed it can keep them safe and secure in their homes and on their streets and in their families. Let's find out what's happening in Mike Harris's Ontario when it comes to education.

We've got a woman called Tracey Martin. She's the mother of a six-year-old in grade 2 in Kitchener. Recently when Ms Martin asked about her daughter's school day, she was told, "We don't go to the library any more on Mondays because of the cutbacks," because of Snobelen's attack on public education. It's not important for grade 2 six-year-olds in Kitchener, according to Mr Snobelen, to get into school libraries.

A Renfrew principal, one Michael Lavertey, over at St Joseph's high school in Renfrew wrote a letter to the Premier. It was an open letter written on October 24. He wrote the Premier saying: "Although our student population increased, we lost the equivalent of one teacher. What that did" — he wrote — "was close our library resource centre and caused the loss of several subjects from the curriculum." He closed his letter to the Premier by saying, "Don't tell me that cuts don't hurt kids."

Up north in Atikokan, let me tell you, the Atikokan Roman Catholic Separate School Board — again, you're familiar with the turf. It's an isolated board where funding decisions are made directly by the ministry. Do you know what happened this year? The ministry cut the staff at St Patrick's Elementary School by half a teacher. Because operating funds are tied to the number of teachers — this is the double whammy here — the staff cut also meant a loss to the board of \$10,000, which is equivalent to 17% of the money available for classrooms.

What does it mean for students in Atikokan at the Atikokan Roman Catholic Separate School Board? It means there's a grade 6 teacher only in the morning, and in the afternoon the grade 6, 7 and 8 classes are in full rotation so that grade 6 has a full day. There is no grade 6 home room and the students spend the last 20 minutes with whatever teacher is available.

In Trenton, back down to southern getting into eastern Ontario, the teacher there, Barb Hoddinott from St Mary's school in Trenton has 27 students in her grade 8 class, one third identified as needing help with reading, writing and oral language skills. Last year these nine students would have had four periods each week with the resource teacher. This year they get four periods every other week. This government has abandoned kids with special needs, kids who deserve more in one of the most prosperous places, if not the most affluent place, in the world, but a place where the wealth is increasingly monopolized by fewer and fewer people and fewer and fewer corporate entities.

They used to get four periods every week. Now they only get four periods, these nine kids with special needs, every other week. It's because of the cuts. It's because of

this government's cuts. It's because of John Snobelen's cuts, because of Mike Harris's cuts. And let's understand that none of this happens in isolation; none of this could happen without the support of each and every one of these backbenchers. They're parties to the offence. They're aiding and abetting crimes against kids in schools, kids who are as innocent as any victim could ever be.

All the students in Barb Hoddinott's class are missing out on necessary preparation for high school, like developing research skills, because there's no librarian in the school this year. That was dismissed, you see, by the government, by Harris and the gang, as one of those out-of-classroom expenditures. The librarian was dismissed — oh, so unnecessary — as an out-of-classroom expenditure.

These guys just don't get it. I don't think they understand the devastation they're leaving in their wake. I don't think they understand how cruel their attacks on public education are and the savagery of those attacks and how many victims are being left behind.

Speaker, I know you've relieved the other Speaker. Did you get a chance — I mentioned earlier the poem by Robert Priest. You didn't, Speaker? I knew you'd be interested. I was telling the other Speaker that I was up at the Toronto Artists for Democracy event. They had a concert called My City Versus Megacity, and Fiona Reid was the emcee. Wonderful people were there. June Callwood was there and great singer-songwriters. Moxxy Frúvous were there and actors, poets and performers. Oh, gosh, Ian Brown from CBC was there, and great poets, Shafik. In any event, Robert Priest was there. Robert Priest is a member of the cultural community here in Toronto and a poet.

Thank you, Charles. I appreciate it very much.

Mr Charles Summers: You're welcome.

Mr Kormos: I think you just got yourself on Hansard, Charles.

Mr Charles Summers: Do you know what? I told my friend to watch TV.

The Acting Speaker (Ms Marilyn Churley): Order, please.

Mr Kormos: Charles, where are you from?

Mr Charles Summers: I'm from Belleville.

Mr Kormos: Charles, from Belleville, one of our pages.

I was going to tell you, Speaker, Robert Priest, the poet, put together — and I'm not sure it took him a long time to do it. He seems to be a rather spontaneous and creative guy. Let me share this with you, a poem by Robert Priest. He put it to music. They sang it twice. The audience loved it. I'd be loath to read this on to the record if I didn't think it was reflective, because the audience joined in. There was a chorus of over a thousand voices joining in this anthem, this new anthem, for Ontarians. It's called Free Ontario. Verse one went like this:

We're gonna clean out the Eves, chase off the thieves,
tell Mike Harris where to go.

We're gonna flush 'em down the drain,
pull the Leach from our veins and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
and Mike keeps Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dopes back to the slopes,
and free Ontario.

And when we kick out their butts, we'll cut all the cuts,
just tell them megacity, no.

We're gonna break off all our chains,
pull the Leach from our veins and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
they all keep Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dinks back to the links,
and free Ontario.

The hairs are standing up on my arms. This is a chilling anthem for desperate people here in the province of Ontario who have had enough and simply can't take any more. I'm going to send you a copy of that, Speaker. I know you'd want to keep that because people are going to be singing that on street corners. You're going to hear it — people are going to break into song spontaneously on subways, as long as the subways keep running, until they're privatized, when the fees and tariffs go up two and three times what they are so obviously a whole lot of people won't be able to afford to take them.

1710

The Harris agenda, when it comes to Bill 108, has nothing to do with streamlining the administration of justice. It has everything to do with cutbacks and down-loading, just like education and the Harris agenda around his so-called high school reform. It's about cutbacks, not about education, Speaker. You know that. It's about cutbacks, not about education.

You know the Premier keeps talking about how the province has taken some \$5 billion away from communities by virtue of assuming the cost of education. So what? Because we know he's not going to put \$5.4 billion into education and he's downloaded over \$8 billion on to municipalities. In regional Niagara alone, new costs necessitating new taxes of over \$73 million: big bucks. A new tax load, on average, per household in regional Niagara of over \$400 a year. That's a lot of money to a lot of the folks down in regional Niagara. It's all about the Harris dump.

You know that over in West Lincoln, people have been mobilizing and fighting back. They have. In one of the meetings called by the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital Action Committee, a citizen's committee that's designed to save their hospitals, specifically in their case the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital — this government wants to shut it down. This government doesn't care about the sick, the ill, the injured of West Lincoln. It doesn't want them to have a hospital. But I tell you, some 5,000 folks came out in a rally in West Lincoln a few weeks ago to say no to Mike Harris: "Our hospital is not yours to shut down."

Jim Dowden, the chair of the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital Action Committee, was among the people here today to observe the vote on the private member's resolution this morning, a vote which some government members participated in by voting in support of, a vote which most government members opposed. This is where I get back to how we've got to be careful. We can't start blaming Mike Harris for all that's being done, because he can't do it without the support of his backbenchers. Let's make that perfectly clear.

The Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services, you know, there he is condemning a hospital restructuring committee for shutting down the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital and condemning the lack of consultation. Where was he when they were shutting down the London Psychiatric Hospital and St Thomas Psychiatric? Where's he on that hospital shutdown? This province has historically been underserved when it comes to psychiatric treatment and the range of facilities that are necessary to respond to the scourge of psychiatric illness, and this government's shutting them down.

Where's the Minister of Correctional Services when it comes to the London and St Thomas psychiatric hospitals? You see, he wants to appear to his constituents in his riding — he wants to distance himself from Mike Harris all of a sudden. It's like Peter in the Garden of Gethsemane. "Mike? Mike who?"

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Why, the member who really wants to shut down the Port Colborne hospital, that's the member for Niagara South. Oh yes, a hue and cry, he'll go to the rallies and talk about keeping that Port Colborne hospital open, but he'll still vote with this government time after time and he'll refuse to tell his constituents that the shutdown of Port Colborne General Hospital is part and parcel of a broader agenda of this government.

You can't have it both ways. You can't be a Harrisite — which is an interesting turn of phrase because it's I suppose a play of words on parasite — you can't be a Harrisite just part of the time. You're either with him or you're agin him. I tell you, I make no bones about it, I'm against him. There's no halfway point.

It isn't just good enough to keep the hospital open in my community, but you've got to understand that hospital shutdowns are running rampant across this province, and that they're joined with the downloading of over \$8 billion on to property taxpayers across Ontario. It's inextricable from the consideration of megacity, which is the most undemocratic, indeed dictatorial imposition of government will that's taken place, I'm sure, in a long, long time.

The privatization of ambulance systems and of fire-fighting services, with the shutdown, among others, of the Niagara Detention Centre, one of the newest detention centres, if not the newest detention centre, in all of Ontario, one of the most efficient. This government wants to give it away so it can be run by who knows, Wackenhut with \$8-an-hour employees, where inmates can be herded into huge pens where there's no rehabilitation, no corrections taking place whatsoever.

I don't know whether Bill 108 has been designated for a committee or not. I'm not sure it has.

Mrs Boyd: Four days.

Mr Kormos: I'm told it's four days. Well, good. I'm looking forward to sitting down with Mr Harnick, the Attorney General, as he is for the moment. Why don't we just cut to the quick here and why doesn't Mike Harris just tell us who the next Attorney General is going to be and let him or her sit down and talk about Bill 108.

In any event, I'm quite prepared to sit down with the Attorney General because I've got a few things I want to ask him about Bill 108, quite frankly about the family

support plan, and quite frankly about the conduct of himself and his staff when they attack the messenger again.

I suppose it's a good thing that Mr Justice LeSage and Mr Justice McMurtry are judges because this Attorney General is inclined to shoot the messenger. A good thing they're judges, otherwise he would have had them arrested and charged by now. That's his style. That's the technique. You know, shoot the messenger, condemn the mere conduit of the message. Don't respond to the message. Don't investigate the significance. Condemn them, just as they have tried to do with these two esteemed judges. They're out of touch. Oh, they're out of touch.

The Attorney General's "out of touch." He's out in orbit. Lord knows, he isn't paying attention to what's going on in his ministry or in the areas, be it the justice system or the family support plan, his ministry's supposed to supervise and service. He isn't at all.

By gosh, Speaker, my time is sadly coming to an end and there are so many more things I wanted to speak about. Here we are, a bill about five, six pages long and so little time to debate it on second reading. I look forward to the questions and comments. I suspect there will be some attacks on the messenger, but that's okay because I'll have a response.

1720

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr Newman: It's my pleasure to rise today in response to the member for Welland-Thorold. Most times when the member for Welland-Thorold has a speech in this House it has nothing to do with the bill at hand, and today is no different.

I think that we on this side have more faith in municipal governments and municipal politicians than the member opposite. A quality justice system in Ontario will be assured with the passage of Bill 108. Municipalities will be expected to uphold provincial standards in performing this role. In order to ensure program integrity, the Ministry of the Attorney General will continue to be responsible for the development and evaluation of performance and compliance standards —

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Kingston and The Islands, come to order.

Mr Newman: — which will be contained in every memorandum of understanding signed by municipal partners.

Both academic and other legal experts are advising the ministry on program standards to ensure fair and equal justice province-wide. In addition, a full training program will be implemented and there is no change in the judicial role. The prosecutor's function will continue to be performed in a skilled, independent, just way, as it has always been.

The member for Welland-Thorold also touched on the topic of justices of the peace, and transferring the administration of the Provincial Offences Act to municipalities is not expected to have an impact on the requirement for the number of justices of the peace or impact their workload.

Smaller municipalities will be encouraged to work together to coordinate their service needs. The only

aspect that changes is that the municipalities will take on the court administration functions, and there's no change to the judicial function which continues to be decided by justices of the peace.

The Provincial Offences Act transfer project estimates a range of potential net revenue to municipalities of between \$40 million and \$65 million. Obviously the fine revenue is dependent on several mitigating factors such as the number of fines laid in a given year, the payment patterns of the fines, new offences or changes in charging patterns.

Mr Gerretsen: Of course the member opposite is quite wrong when he says that the speech of the member for Welland-Thorold did not deal with the subject matter at hand, because, let's face it, this is all part of an integrated plan. This is the reason we're back here. We're back here from January until the middle of March to deal with all these different mega-announcements and the mega-changes that are taking place as far as the funding of different government programs is concerned.

By the government's own figures, we all know that \$5.4 billion is being taken off the property tax roll but that \$6.3 billion is being added on. This \$65-million item that has been put on this chart relating to provincial offences revenues is sort of an offset against the \$6.3 billion that is being downloaded on municipalities. As I've stated before, some municipalities may be able to handle it; others simply will not be able to handle it.

The other point that I'd like to return to is the notion that the government itself cannot even agree on how much money we're talking about in transferring provincial offences to the municipal level. According to their own documents, \$65 million is being raised by way of revenues by municipalities, and according to the Crombie commission, which is the government's own commission, only about \$30 million is being realized as a result of this transfer to the local municipalities.

I would dare say that if the government can't even get it right on such a relatively minor matter as this, can we have any faith in them at all in transfers when we're talking about \$5.4 billion in the transfer from education and the \$6.3-billion downloading on municipalities? I don't think so.

Mrs Boyd: We all learn a lot when the member for Welland-Thorold stands, particularly when he stands for 90 minutes as he did today. I must tell him I had missed the poem that he read to us a number of times and I want him to know that I agree with him. Given the groundswell in public opinion against this government, I think it's going to be a number one hit very soon and I'm glad he shared it with us and with the people of Ontario. I'm glad he did it in such a way that it wasn't a provincial offence, because heaven knows what might have happened.

However, all joking aside, this bill is just part of a whole general program that this government has in place, and this is the bone that is being tossed to the municipalities in the hope that they will not notice the downloading that is a huge problem for all of them, a problem that, as they study the situation and really look at what the components are, gets worse and worse.

Certainly the member mentioned some of the issues that are impinging on that even as we speak, and I will certainly say that the impact of the closure of two psychiatric hospitals in London and St Thomas will have a tremendous effect on the cost of that download to those two communities. He is right to point out that when we look at a bill like this that may be seemingly innocuous on the surface, we must look at it in context and understand that it's part of a — if I were sure that everyone read things, because the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale was complaining that I was reading in the Legislature and seemed to think that wasn't work — if they've read anything, I suspect it's Machiavelli's *The Prince*, and they've absorbed the lessons from that book very well.

Mr O'Toole: It's a pleasure today to get up and respond to the statements made by the member for Welland-Thorold. He didn't speak about the bill, but for 90 minutes he entertained us. I think he wrote the lyrics to a song.

Interjection: Is he an actor?

Mr O'Toole: Poetry in motion, you might say. But I think each one of the people participating here today learned from the member for Kingston and The Islands, who is a former mayor of Kingston, who was quick to respond to the challenge here to be a full partner with the Attorney General. Also, the member for Scarborough Centre brought us completely up to date on the thrust here of the Provincial Offences Act.

Also, I must comment that the member for London Centre, as a former Attorney General of the previous government, was quick to recognize the benefits of partnering when they downloaded — no, I shouldn't use the word "download" — when they transferred responsibilities down to the municipalities for traffic offences, and that was in 1993. We must recognize that the other government did some very good things. The only thing is, we're going further; we're trying to realize all of the efficiencies. I appreciate your response, because we keep a very close eye on your history, your present and your future.

I might just note that 75 municipalities were quick to get involved. The Provincial Offences Act sets out procedures to be followed under provincial statutes and municipal bylaws. Part I covers minor ticket offences, which to a large extent are being covered today. Part III offences will not be part of it. The administrative portion of the offence will be handled by the municipality. Serious traffic violations or impaired driving etc would not be handled by the municipality. But I think it's a very good opportunity for larger municipal areas to take on the responsibility that they've wanted for many years.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. The member's time is up. The member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: There's something incredibly dangerous about believing your own advertising, and these guys fall for it all the time. They just bite. You just throw that lure out and you hook them in the upper lip quick as a boo.

I just got a telephone message. I've been talking about the anthem I've been hearing across the city, in subways, on street corners. As I'm walking down Wellesley Street to get here to Queen's Park, people are singing this, they're bursting into song spontaneously. It's a Robert

Priest creation. With Robert Priest's permission — and I spoke to the pleasure of a whole lot of people who have been singing this in their own right. Robert Priest wrote this song:

We're gonna clean out the Eves, chase off the thieves,
tell Mike Harris where to go.

We're gonna flush 'em down the drain,
pull the Leach from our veins and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
and Mike keeps Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dopes back to the slopes,
and free Ontario.

And when we kick out their butts, we'll cut all the cuts,
just tell them megacity, no.

We're gonna break off all our chains,
pull the Leach from our veins and free Ontario.

'Cause Johnson's a weenie and so is Palladini,
they all keep Harrissing the poor.

We're gonna send all those dinks back to the links,
and free Ontario.

When you hear that song — well, you remember the old song, when it's one person singing it, it's one thing, when it's two people singing it, but when it's three people singing it, it's a movement, right? When you hear that song, those words are going to echo through people's minds like those old Bee Gees songs used to on a Sunday morning. When you hear that song echoing through the streets of Toronto, you know that Torontonians are on track.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

1730

Mr Bill Vankoughnet (Frontenac-Addington): I am pleased today to speak about and in support of Bill 108. Bill 108 is the next logical step up from the transferring of parking tickets to municipalities several years ago by the previous administration. Now 95% of parking tickets are dealt with by municipalities, and this has resulted in service being provided to the public at less cost, doing more for less, something that this government has championed for some time. The parking ticket experience proves that there are a number of benefits to be had by involving municipalities more directly in the administration of justice.

With Bill 108, the government is eliminating waste and duplication and consolidating the administration for provincial offences. One of the maxims of this government is eliminating waste and duplication, so I applaud another fine example of finding more efficiency.

I will reiterate a good example that the Attorney General has previously brought to this Legislature's attention: Administrative processes are duplicated when two offices process a single certificate of offence. With our changes, only the municipal office would process the certificate. This makes good sense for the taxpayer as well as the municipality.

What also makes good sense in Bill 108 for the participating municipalities is the opportunity for them to retain the net revenues from the fines generated within the Provincial Offences Act. Estimates are that up to \$65 million in revenue could be directed to Ontario municipalities. Local services could be the beneficiary of this new source of revenue, even when one takes into account

the costs of these new responsibilities. In the Kingston-Napanee area revenues have been estimated to be as high as \$2 million annually. This is promising news for our local stakeholders.

The province has been committed to the victims of crime. This government passed a Victims' Bill of Rights which enshrined in law a dedicated fund for services to victims of crime, and it continues to be committed to victims of crime. The victims of crime fine surcharge will still be taken from fine revenues. The revenue generated from the victim fine surcharge will be forwarded to the victims' justice fund. The partner municipalities would retain the balance of fines after the victim fine surcharge and other program costs are submitted to the province.

This bill allows the province to focus on the real threats to public safety, people accused of violent crimes. People accused of violent crimes should be treated differently than those accused of minor offences. This bill will allow the province to expeditiously prosecute dangerous criminals and deal more efficiently with serious civil matters and possibly free up courtrooms for the future. Violent criminals have for too long been treated with kid gloves. Bill 108 reaffirms the message that this law-and-order government is working to protect law-abiding Ontario citizens. Many people in Frontenac-Addington have expressed concern over the years regarding the haphazard manner in which dangerous criminals are handled, and I think they will be pleased with the changes we refer to in Bill 108.

I am happy that the responsibilities set for transfer to municipalities under Bill 108 are, to name a few, the administration of parts I, II and III of the Provincial Offences Act and prosecution of part I or minor ticket offences. Some 80% of part I offences are issued under the Highway Traffic Act. Some examples of these infractions are failing to wear a seatbelt or not heeding a red light or a stop sign. Part III offences will continue to be prosecuted by the province, as they generally result in jail sentences.

Standards for administration of justice will be set and monitored by the province as per usual. The province will maintain the setting and monitoring standards for the administration of justice to guarantee a uniform, fair and equitable form of justice across the province. Fairness and equity, I might add, are also pillars of this government.

Judges and justices of the peace appointed by the province will continue to decide Provincial Offences Act cases.

The province proposes to initiate and invite municipalities to submit proposals for this partnership. I believe this is an excellent idea. The municipalities interested in responding to the invitation to take part in the transfer will be required to meet specific criteria. The criteria include the readiness and ability to meet provincial requirements and standards. The municipalities selected are obliged to sign a memorandum of understanding. The agreement sets out the respective roles of the Attorney General and each municipal partner.

Representing a largely rural area, the following is important to many in my constituency: The bill allows municipalities to choose to team up and serve traditional

court catchment areas or other reasonable population concentrations if the municipalities are too small to handle provincial offences on their own.

I like the timing of the implementation of this bill. It will be undertaken in a staged process. The initial transfer will commence in the spring of 1997 and the projected completion date is April 1999. The municipal partners will have the better part of two years to adjust to the new setup, plenty of time indeed.

I also like the fact that these amendments were developed with the input of legal and municipal experts, internal and external stakeholders, the judiciary, the bar and the municipal sector. This bill was developed and supported by David Crombie's Who Does What panel and has been well received by municipalities.

The municipalities are pleased about the prospect of taking on the responsibility for local justice and the benefit of an increase in local revenue from this transfer. Municipal leaders from around Ontario have voiced support about this coming opportunity. I truly feel that the competency and level of Ontario municipal politicians is extremely high. It is unnecessary for the province to administer when there is such a high calibre of local leadership in the municipalities of this great province.

I for one and many of my colleagues in this House have been pleased with the support they have given us in the past, and Bill 108 is another fine example. As this government has already done many times, it is again taking the lead by inviting municipalities to be partners in the justice system.

I would like to urge all members of this House to support Bill 108. The opportunities that municipalities have in becoming partners with the provincial government in the justice system exemplify our confidence in the future of local government in Ontario.

The Acting Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mr Gerretsen: I listened with great interest to my colleague immediately to the west of my own riding. It's very interesting that he talks about municipal partnership and how it will be left up to the municipalities as to whether or not they want to join in on this particular system. It left me to wonder why the government didn't take the same approach with respect to the water and sewer legislation that has been debated in this House for the last three or four days. In that particular case, municipalities had no choice. They're told to take the plants, and that's it, and they'll have to bear all the expenses related thereto.

It's also interesting that when we look at the Development Charges Act, which will be debated next week, if this member really believes so much in partnership between the province and municipalities, in that particular case the province isn't leaving it up to the municipalities to determine what the proper development charges are in a municipality. That particular bill is going to severely limit the ways in which municipalities can charge for development charges. What we're looking for is some consistency.

1740

I think it's good, generally speaking, that municipalities have a choice as to whether they want to take over the Provincial Offences Act. There will be some municipi-

palities, like my own, that will gladly take it over. They're large enough; they've got the staff complement to able to handle it. But there are also municipalities that will simply not be in that position. That goes whether we're talking about provincial offences, that goes whether we're talking about taking over water and sewer plants, and the same thing goes with respect to development charges and many of the other pieces of legislation that come before us.

What I say to the government is, be consistent. Don't say one day that you want to be partners with municipalities and then the next day you turn something over to municipalities whether they want to or not. Be consistent.

Mrs Boyd: It's hard to comment for two minutes on such a brief speech. I am very interested that the member for Frontenac-Addington was interested in this particular bill and chose to speak on it.

The reality continues to be that although this bill in itself, as the member points out, is not necessarily a bad thing, what is missing are the kind of standards and the kind of accountability that ensure that the problems that the Liberal opposition and our party have raised are going to be dealt with by municipalities in these agreements with the ministry.

The reality is, we are being asked to just accept on faith that there will be a uniform application of the Provincial Offences Act once this is the purview of various municipalities and that we will not see any difference in the enforcement and the prosecution of provincial offences from one municipality to another.

It may be that this government still expects that people will take at face value what they say they expect to happen, but increasingly what we are seeing is the citizens of Ontario saying they're rather tired of the empty promises, that there's nothing to worry about, you know, this "Be happy, don't worry" message that we're all having to tolerate on our television sets all the time. The people aren't buying it. The people are saying: "Where are the standards? Where is the accountability? How can we be sure that's true? Why are we expected to buy a whole package which depends entirely on the contents of an agreement when there's not even a model agreement that we've seen and when there has been very little consultation with the municipalities?"

Mr Newman: It's my pleasure to rise in response to the member for Frontenac-Addington. I want to compliment him on being the only member to make a speech here today that actually dealt with Bill 108. I congratulate him on that. His speech again showed that the members on the government side have more faith in municipal governments and municipal politicians than the members opposite.

I'd like to put into the record what the city of Burlington feels about Bill 108. It says here:

"The city supports the transfer and is anxious to begin a dialogue with the ministry concerning the transfer. We believe the transfer offers an opportunity to provide the required service to the residents of Burlington at a low cost and with maximum efficiencies."

It goes on to say, "Burlington is eager to assume the responsibility of the administration and prosecution of provincial offences, not only for the city itself but for the

entire region of Halton.” That’s signed by the city manager of Burlington.

The regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton says, “The region is eager to move forward in this initiative as soon as possible.” So it’s right across Ontario.

The city of Vaughan says:

“This is to indicate Vaughan’s interest in being one of the municipalities selected to participate in the initial 1997 transfer of the Provincial Offences Act administration and prosecution. Council gave initial consideration to such a proposal at its meeting on January 6. The city will make a formal proposal in response.”

Just like the city of Brampton, a letter here:

“The staff of the city of Brampton has been involved in working closely with the Ministry of Attorney General and the provincial offences project team on the proposed transfer of court administration and prosecution responsibilities to the municipalities. The city is excited” — excited — “about the prospects of a net revenue gain and, upon approval of council, the city looks forward to entering into a partnership with the province.”

The Acting Speaker: Your time is up. Further questions or comments?

Mr O’Toole: Again, it’s a pleasure to get up and compliment the member for Frontenac-Addington for a very consistent, very coherent presentation on Bill 108. In fact, I think the member in a couple of his comments recognized the efficiencies for all Ontarians by reducing this down to the lowest level of delivery of service as possible. I think there’s a clear indication by the action from the previous government — I’ve said this before. The previous government under the Provincial Offences Act in 1993 introduced some part II changes. There were, I believe, some 60 municipalities which participated in that. This is the issuing and prosecution of traffic offences which are really traffic tickets, meaning parking tickets, and municipalities administered it, collected the revenue and were allowed to enforce their own bylaws. I could list a number here.

Mr Newman: Is Kingston there?

Mr O’Toole: Kingston’s here, and St Catharines, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Niagara Falls, very progressive communities. There’s no reason why smaller municipalities couldn’t join in that partnership arrangement as we move towards a further partnering in these changes under Bill 108.

Again, the member for Frontenac-Addington did spend his time — I was looking forward to a full 90 minutes. I was somewhat disappointed that he didn’t utilize all of that time because he was bringing about some very important points.

Part I offences under the Provincial Offences Act cover such things as minor ticket offences like noise, speeding, nuisance bylaws. Part II covers parking infractions, which was the part introduced by the previous government. Part III covers the serious offences; for example, speeding over 50 miles per hour, impaired driving. These changes, however, will not be transferred at this time, only the municipal administration portion. Now, where in fact some municipalities are doing that today —

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. Your time is up. The member for Frontenac-Addington.

Mr Vankoughnet: It’s certainly a pleasure for me to respond to my colleagues and say that I do appreciate the support that we’re getting for better quality service and lower cost to the taxpayers, because yes, this is what this is all about. We’re trying to provide better services and certainly at lower costs.

My colleague from Kingston and The Islands referred to the support from the city of Kingston, and of course recently at a meeting in my riding which the mayor attended, he was very supportive of this bill and thanked the minister profusely for bringing in this new act, and I think it’s on record too in this House several times that he’s sent letters to that accord also.

So I think it’s very important that we keep on the track that we have suggested, better partnerships with other municipalities at the other level of government, and correct some of the injustices that I know for a fact have been there over the years. For example, I know my home town of Napanee, a community of under 5,000, has to pay the court security costs, the property taxpayers in that municipality. As you know, Madam Speaker, there are large institutions in the vicinity, for example Millhaven institution, and of course, being the county town, the court costs to those taxpayers in that municipality have been horrendous. This will help to offset some of these costs to the taxpayers in that municipality.

Another thing, for example, the Quinte Detention Centre, across the road in another municipality: The town of Napanee property taxpayers in the past have had to pay for court security costs. Again, I believe this will help compensate indirectly the people of that community for the injustices of the past. So I’m glad to see that we’re making improvements —

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. Your time is up. Further debate?

Mr Gerretsen: I know that we have about 10 or 12 minutes left and I guess we’re voting on this matter at that point in time, but let me first of all address some of the issues that were raised by the members opposite. Let me indicate quite clearly that I have every faith in municipalities and in local government. I think that absolutely a lot of these decisions are a lot better left at the local level.

But what I would challenge the government members to do is to get the letters of support ready to introduce here from the municipal leaders about the water and sewer act. Let’s see the letters of support there, where you’re forcing the municipalities to take over old and decrepit water and sewer facilities whether they like it or not, whether they’ve got the financial ability to pay or not.

1750

I would like them to produce the letters with respect to the Development Charges Act. Let me see the letters you’ve got from the municipalities in which they’re saying: “Yes, please limit our powers. We don’t want to be able to negotiate with the developers in a free and open way. You’ve got to limit what we can actually ask for from the developers.” Where are the letters? I’d like you to have those letters read into the record.

Do you know why there are no letters? They aren’t there because in those particular cases municipalities are saying to the province, their “partner”: “Why are you

doing this to us? Why don't you give us the option as to whether or not we want to take over the water and sewer plant? Why don't you allow us to decide what's best with respect to the development charges that we want to levy against developers?" There are many other areas as well.

No, your government is taking the attitude that if it's something that municipalities want and you're ready to give it to them, you're ready to download it on them, then they're partners. If it's something they don't want, then all of a sudden the partnership is over and done with.

Let's just go back once again to what this is really all about. This is really about a downloading of \$6.3 billion on the property taxpayers of this province. What does that mean in the different communities? From a presentation that was made in the city of Kingston by the same mayor, Gary Bennett, from whom you got that letter with respect to Bill 108 — what did he say in a presentation he made two weeks ago tomorrow? He said:

"Based on our own calculations, which are reasonable and based for the most part on information provided...show that the current city of Kingston would be a net loser to the tune of \$28.6 million" as a result of the downloading.

"This translates into an average increase in residential taxes of \$546 per household and a 42% increase in commercial property taxes as commercial properties still must pay an education property tax levy."

That's what this is really all about; it's all about downloading. Let's take a look at some of the actual figures there. He calculates, and the city treasurer, who is not a partisan politician, calculates that there is a \$24-million saving by taking the education taxes off the property tax roll. However, there's a \$32-million increase in general welfare and FBA benefits the city will have to pay; \$1.6 million in day care; social housing, \$6.5 million. That's for a relatively small city of some 65,000 or 75,000 people.

In long-term care there will be an add-on to the city of \$4.9 million; public health programs that which will be funded 100% by the municipality will be increased by \$1 million; homes for special care, \$450,000; Kingston transit, \$1.2 million; Kingston Access Bus, which will be 100% municipally funded, half a million dollars; ambulance, which will be 100% funded municipally, \$1.3 million.

It's a total of \$53.8 million. Once you take the \$24 million that comes off as a result of the education taxes being taken off the residential property tax roll, there will be a net increase of \$28.6 million. That's what the people of Ontario have to understand, that their property taxes in the case of the city of Kingston are going up \$546 per household. We've got many figures from many other municipalities that relate to exactly the same thing. I won't bore you with them today because we've read them into the record many times before.

Why is the province doing this? We have to get back to that. The province is doing this because, according to a study that has been done by a senior citizens' group and the VON in the Kingston area, by the year 2011 — so we're talking about less than 13 to 14 years from today — the school-age population will have increased by 12%, but the aging population, people 65 years of age

and over, will have increased by 52%. What's really happening here is that a relatively stable cost, where you're going to have a relatively small increase in the number of children attending school, is going to be paid for by the province. On the other hand, the aging population which will require the home care services, which will require the social services, which will require the health services is going to increase by 52%.

The backbenchers and even one or two cabinet ministers can be shaking their heads no, and maybe you haven't been informed by your political masters as to what this is really all about, but you tell me then why the transfers are taking place. Tell me why the transfers are taking place if your government doesn't see, from a provincial viewpoint, some substantial saving down the line. The reason why you're doing it is because you want to burden this on the local property taxpayers so the local politicians can be taking the heat in the future when there are going to be greater demands in the areas that you're offloading. This is what this is really all about.

I think the time has come when the people of Ontario are starting to understand this. I think it's very interesting, the whole megacity debate that's been taking place in the city of Toronto. I dare say if it wasn't for all the downloading that's taking place at the same time, there wouldn't be such a swell of anti-megacity feeling in this particular city. People are starting to realize. They're starting to clue in and starting to say, "My gosh, that extra \$5 or \$10 that I'm going to get as a result of this 30% tax cut, which is basically going to help those people making \$100,000 or more, how is it going to affect me?" Well, Madam and Mr Taxpayer, it's going to cost you another \$550 on average in property taxes. You could be shaking your head no, but that's what's going to happen.

Let's hear what the Frontenac-Kingston Council on Aging has to say. This is another organization that is mainly concerned about care in the social welfare and health area and care for senior citizens. It states:

"It is vital that all the residents of Ontario understand the long-range impact of these massive changes that will affect not only this generation but generations to come. If these changes become law" — and she's talking about all the downloading — "will any future government have the political will to reverse them and take back funding and responsibility to the provincial level?"

"In our view, Ontario is sitting on the wall like Humpty Dumpty." Christine MacMillan sums it up so nicely when she says if these mega-week initiatives are not stopped, and I quote, "all the Queen's horses and all the Queen's citizens will not be able to put Ontario back together again."

That's what this is all about. It isn't about one isolated bill in which, yes, you're giving something to municipalities. It's a little bit like the police services bill. I know that municipalities have for years argued that they want control of their police commissions and control of their budgets. So what have you done? You've pacified them after many, many years.

I can remember when I was president of AMO the municipal police authorities arguing for greater control. You've finally given it to them and I congratulate you on that, but what have you downloaded on them? You've

downloaded on all the smaller municipalities all the OPP costs. AMO or any of those groups never said, "We want control of our police budgets and we want control of the police commissions etc, and you can unload all of the costs on us as well." They never said that.

I think the people of Ontario are starting to realize that all these great announcements that the government has been bringing forward over the last six to eight weeks are just a sham. They're seeing that really nothing is going to change other than the fact that they may be getting a few more dollars in their pockets. Some people may be getting a few more dollars, but other people in effect will be paying a lot more through property taxes.

I understand, Madam Speaker, you're eyeing the clock and you probably want to leave this place as much as all of us do so we can go back to the ridings and tell the people in our ridings what's happening at Queen's Park. Unfortunately from my perspective, everything that's happening here is not going to help the local citizens that we represent in the long run. There may be a benefit to some of them, particularly the wealthy in our society, but certainly not the average taxpayer.

We've got to remember that by taking \$5.4 billion off the property tax system through the residential education tax burden being removed, we're adding on \$6.3 billion. The people of Ontario will have to raise an extra billion dollars in property taxes if they want to maintain the same kinds of services they currently enjoy. With that, it almost being 6 of the clock, I will at this time conclude the debate.

The Acting Speaker: Are there questions and comments? No?

Mr Harnick has moved second reading of Bill 108. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I ask that the bill be referred to the standing committee on general government.

The Acting Speaker: So ordered.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Acting Speaker (Ms Marilyn Churley): Pursuant to standing order 34, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made. The member for London Centre has given notice of her dissatisfaction with the answer to her question given by the Minister of Health concerning the impact of downloading on the delivery of community-based services where psychiatric hospitals close. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the minister or the parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): It appears that neither the minister nor the parliamentary assistant is available, and that is exactly the problem we seem to face

in terms of trying to get questions answered around the restructuring reports that come forward with this government.

The point that we were making with the Minister of Health today was that he has set up under Bill 26 a commission to restructure hospital care in this province. Those folks were mandated to go out and study the situation and make recommendations around, first of all, what level of hospital services we needed; what type, what the governance of those services was going to be, where they were to be located; and where there was downsizing, how the identified patient need could be met within the community. They have the authority to close hospitals but they do not have the authority to require the Ministry of Health to do the second part of that task, which is to ensure that the services are available in communities where hospitals have been downsized or eliminated to ensure that the patient needs continue to be met.

My question to him today was: In London-Middlesex and in Elgin county, where the two psychiatric hospitals are to be closed by December 31, 1999, and the number of beds reduced by some 300-plus beds for chronic mental health patients in the area — that includes the beds in Windsor and in Waterloo — how are those needs going to be met? Once you're not in the hospital, how are you going to survive? You survive on social assistance and you usually survive on the Gains-D program. That's all faced with a whole problem around redefinition of what is a long-term disability, what is an ongoing chronic disability. Most of these folks would qualify, but this government has now downloaded an additional 30% of the costs of FBA, under which is the Gains-D program, to the municipalities — an additional 30%. They have also downloaded social housing; they've also downloaded homes for special care by 100%; they've also downloaded long-term care by 50% to municipalities.

My question to the minister was, under those circumstances — that download has happened since this committee went out, met with people and made its recommendations — and given that download and given the level of municipal responsibility that would have to be met through property tax, a regressive property tax, how does he think St Thomas and London are going to manage to provide the kinds of services that the people who no longer have a home in those two psychiatric facilities are going to need?

We thought that was a particularly reasonable question because we asked the commission that question and the commission was embarrassed because they were clearly saying to us: "Look, the rules changed in the middle of the game. Our recommendations are based on what our mandate was, what our study was. We have no control over what the provincial government decides to download on its municipal partners. We were making the assumption that we could tell the Minister of Health the \$46 million saved in terms of this restructuring plan in mental health services in the southwestern region, and particularly in St Thomas and London, 'That will all go into use within the community, and you don't need to worry because those services will be there.'"

My point to the minister was that the commission can no longer make that assumption or that assurance to the people in our areas, because the responsibility for the funding of the very basic services — never mind the counselling, never mind the drug programs that may be there to monitor drugs, never mind the psychology assistance that may be needed or the social work assistance; all that will be needed — but the basic programs have not been downloading on to our community.

That was the question we asked. It's the question we'll continue to ask because this has an enormous economic impact for our communities, particularly given the anticipation of anywhere up to 1,500 jobs beings lost as a result of this single decision.

The Acting Speaker: There being no further matter to debate, I deem the motion to adjourn to be carried, and this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock on Monday afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1803.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

Administration of justice / Administration de la justice

Chair / Président: Gerry Martiniuk
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ron Johnson
 Robert Chiarelli, David Christopherson,
 Bruce Crozier, Ed Doyle, Garry J. Guzzo,
 Tim Hudak, Ron Johnson, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,
 Gary L. Leadston, Gerry Martiniuk,
 John L. Parker, David Ramsay, David Tilson
 Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Rick Bartolucci
 Toby Barrett, Rick Bartolucci, Gilles Bisson,
 Jim Brown, Michael A. Brown, John C. Cleary,
 Morley Kells, Gerard Kennedy, Frances Lankin,
 Allan K. McLean, E.J. Douglas Rollins, Frank Sheehan,
 Bill Vankoughnet, Wayne Wettlaufer
 Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs / Finances et affaires économiques

Chair / Président: Ted Chudleigh
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tim Hudak
 Isabel Bassett, Jim Brown, Ted Chudleigh,
 Joseph Cordiano, Douglas B. Ford, Tim Hudak,
 Monte Kwinter, Tony Martin, Gerry Martiniuk,
 Gerry Phillips, Gilles Pouliot, E.J. Douglas Rollins,
 Joseph Spina, Wayne Wettlaufer
 Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Bart Maves
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
 Mike Colle, Harry Danford, Jim Flaherty,
 Michael Gravelle, Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese,
 Bart Maves, Julia Munro, Lillian Ross,
 Mario Sergio, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
 Len Wood, Terence H. Young
 Clerk / Greffière: Lynn Mellor

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Floyd Laughren
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony Silipo
 Rick Bartolucci, Ed Doyle, Douglas B. Ford,
 Gary Fox, Michael Gravelle, Bert Johnson,
 Peter Kormos, Floyd Laughren, Gary L. Leadston,
 Frank Miclash, Dan Newman, Peter L. Preston,
 Tony Silipo, Bob Wood
 Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Ted Arnott
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John Hastings
 Ted Arnott, Dave Boushy, Tony Clement,
 Ivin Curling, Carl DeFaria, Bill Grimmett,
 John Hastings, Ron Johnson, Margaret Marland,
 Gilles E. Morin, Sandra Papatello, Tony Silipo,
 R. Gary Stewart, Bud Wildman
 Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Ombudsman

Chair / Président: John L. Parker
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tom Froese
 Carl DeFaria, Barbara Fisher, Tom Froese, Pat Hoy,
 W. Leo Jordan, Jean-Marc Lalonde, Rosario Marchese,
 Bill Murdoch, John R. O'Toole, John L. Parker,
 Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart, Bill Vankoughnet,
 Len Wood
 Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: Bernard Grandmaître
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Richard Patten
 Marcel Beaubien, Dave Boushy, Gary Carr, Brenda Elliott,
 Gary Fox, Bernard Grandmaître, John Hastings,
 Jean-Marc Lalonde, Shelley Martel, Richard Patten,
 Gilles Pouliot, Sandra Papatello, Derwyn Shea, Toni
 Skarica
 Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Regulations and private bills / Règlements et projets de loi privés

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Smith
 Ted Arnott, Toby Barrett, Gilles Bisson, Dave Boushy,
 John Gerretsen, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
 Gerard Kennedy, Tony Martin, Trevor Pettit,
 Lillian Ross, Tony Ruprecht, Frank Sheehan, Bruce Smith
 Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

Resources development / Développement des ressources

Chair / Président: Brenda Elliott
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Barbara Fisher
 Dominic Agostino, John R. Baird, David Christopherson,
 Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Sean G. Conway,
 Brenda Elliott, Barbara Fisher, Doug Galt, Pat Hoy,
 Bart Maves, John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette,
 Joseph N. Tascona
 Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker

Social development / Affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Annamarie Castrilli
 Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Dwight Duncan
 Marion Boyd, Elinor Caplan, Jack Carroll,
 Annamarie Castrilli, Dwight Duncan, Tom Froese,
 Helen Johns, W. Leo Jordan, Lyn McLeod,
 Julia Munro, Trevor Pettit, Peter L. Preston,
 Bruce Smith, Bud Wildman
 Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

CONTENTS

Thursday 27 February 1997

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Teachers' protest , private member's notice of motion number 41, <i>Mr Doyle</i>	
Mr Doyle	7261, 7268
Mr Bartolucci	7262
Mr Wildman	7263
Mr Skarica	7264
Mrs McLeod	7264
Mr Bisson	7265
Mr O'Toole	7266
Mr Bradley	7267
Mr Smith	7268
Agreed to	7278
Hospital restructuring , private member's notice of motion number 42, <i>Mrs Papatello</i>	
Mrs Papatello	7269, 7277
Mrs Boyd	7270
Mr Galt	7272
Mr Kennedy	7273
Mr McLean	7274
Mr Duncan	7275
Mr Agostino	7275
Mr Bradley	7276
Agreed to	7278

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Health care in Sudbury	
Mr Bartolucci	7278
St Peter's Hospital	
Mr Christopherson	7278
Development in Cobourg	
Mr Galt	7278
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Miclash	7279
Justice system	
Mr Kormos	7279
Hospital restructuring	
Mr McLean	7279
Mr Gerretsen	7279
Charitable gaming	
Ms Lankin	7280
Raoul Wallenberg	
Ms Bassett	7280

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr Cordiano	7280
Mr Leach	7280, 7287
Mr Silipo	7287

Hospital restructuring

Mrs Papatello	7281
Mr Wilson	7281, 7282, 7283 7286, 7287, 7289
Mr Hampton	7282
Mr Wildman	7282
Mr Murdoch	7286
Mr Kwinter	7286
Mr Conway	7288
Psychiatric hospitals	
Mr Hampton	7283
Mr Wilson	7283, 7284
Mrs Boyd	7284

Long-term care

Mr Kennedy	7284
Mr Wilson	7284

Education legislation

Mr Wildman	7285
Mr Snobelen	7285

Produce-your-own beer

Mr Ford	7288
Mr Tsubouchi	7288

PETITIONS

Hospital restructuring

Mr Bradley	7289
Mrs Elliott	7290
Mr Maves	7292

Occupational health and safety

Mr Christopherson	7289
-------------------	------

North York Branson Hospital

Mr Kwinter	7290
------------	------

Affordable housing

Mrs Boyd	7290
----------	------

Drinking and driving

Mr Baird	7290
----------	------

Fire safety

Mrs McLeod	7290
Ms Martel	7290
Mr Len Wood	7291
Mr Kwinter	7291
Mr Crozier	7292
Mr Christopherson	7292
Mr Bradley	7292
Ms Lankin	7292

GO Transit

Mr Tascona	7290
------------	------

Video lottery terminals

Mr Bradley	7291
------------	------

Municipal restructuring

Mr Newman	7291
Mr Parker	7292

Sexual assault crisis centres

Ms Churley	7291
------------	------

SECOND READINGS

Streamlining of Administration of Provincial Offences, 1997

Bill 108, <i>Mr Harnick</i>	
Mr Bradley	7293, 7298
Mr Kormos	7297, 7298, 7310
Mr Newman	7297, 7309, 7312
Mr Gerretsen	7298, 7309, 7312, 7313
Mrs Boyd	7298, 7310, 7312
Mr O'Toole	7310, 7313
Mr Vankoughnet	7311, 7313
Agreed to	7315

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

Psychiatric hospitals

Mrs Boyd	7315
----------	------

OTHER BUSINESS

Notice of dissatisfaction

Mrs Boyd	7289
The Acting Speaker	7292

Business of the House

Mr David Johnson	7289
------------------	------

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 27 février 1997

AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT

PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

Opposition des enseignants,

Avis de motion numéro 41 émanant d'un député, <i>M. Doyle</i>	
M. Bisson	7266
Adoptée	7278

Restructuration des hôpitaux,

Avis de motion numéro 42 émanant d'une députée, <i>M^{me} Papatello</i>	
M. Bisson	7273
Adoptée	7278

QUESTIONS ORALES

Restructuration des hôpitaux

M. Bisson	7283
M. Morin	7287

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 1997 simplifiant

l'administration en ce qui a trait aux infractions provinciales, projet de loi 108, <i>M. Harnick</i>	
Adoptée	7315

CA20N
x1
D23



No. 171

N° 171

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Monday 3 March 1997

Lundi 3 mars 1997

**Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell**

**Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell**

**Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers**

**Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers**

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 3 March 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 3 mars 1997

*The House met at 1335.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): On Friday I met with seven seniors' groups representing thousands of seniors in Sudbury and hundreds of thousands of seniors across Ontario. This seniors' coalition asked me to take back a very simple message to the government: "The seniors of of Sudbury and across Ontario are dissatisfied with the direction and fear this government is imposing on the citizens of Ontario."

Clarence Soule from the Sudbury Seniors Coalition wants you to make changes. He and the other people in attendance deplore your downloading of health care to municipalities. He and Roy Edey from SOAR want you to reinvest real dollars. Where is the MRI for Sudbury? Why is it being delayed two years? What's happened to long-term care? What type of reinvestment of real dollars are you going to be making in long-term care? Not old money, not redefined money, they want new money invested.

Mel Papke, representing CAW retired workers, wants you to know that the user fees for drugs for seniors is hurting seniors. They're hurting because of your initiatives.

Johnny Passi and Ted Nicholson want you to know that the seniors they represent are under enormous stress, enormous pressure because of the uncertainty of your policies. They don't know what direction to go in because your government doesn't know what direction to go in when it comes to seniors.

ONTARIO RANGER PROGRAM

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): For over 50 years now the Ontario government has supported the Ontario Ranger program. It provides a unique summer employment experience for hundreds of 17-year-olds across Ontario. Participants work for the Ministry of Natural Resources and gain firsthand experience in tree planting, trailblazing, provincial park maintenance, canoe portaging and a host of other outdoor activities.

The program has demonstrated time and again its value in promoting conservation, rehabilitation and good resource management among young people. Thousands of Ontarians, myself included, have provided a valuable public service by participating for a summer in a program which for many years paid far less than the minimum wage.

This Conservative government appears set to cancel this important program. Last week MNR staff confirmed they have no assurances that the Ontario Ranger program will run. They have no funds to operate the 22 camps and they have not sent application forms out to Ontario high schools. If the program were going to run, and run effectively, all of this would have been done by now. In fact ministry staff should be selecting applicants now, not waiting to see if their minister and his Conservative colleagues are going to cough up the money necessary to give some 600 students a chance for a summer job.

Cancelling this program to fund their phoney tax scheme is ridiculous. It proves the Conservatives don't care about helping students get a summer job. It hurts small communities which supply goods and services to the ranger camps and makes a mockery of Conservative rhetoric on protecting our parks.

The minister should do the right thing and fund the Ontario Ranger program now.

PETER NORRIS

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): I am honoured to rise in this House today to congratulate Mr Peter Norris on being named the Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce 1996 Citizen of the Year.

Born and raised in Toronto, Peter spent a number of years in the banking industry and eventually entered the car business. In 1981, Peter purchased a troubled Ford dealership in Peterborough and turned it into a very successful business that has become a household name.

What is special about Peter is what he does away from the office. He has hosted annual charity golf tournaments that have raised over \$150,000 for the Five Counties Children's Centre. He was a founding member of the Peterborough Crime Stoppers; a volunteer teacher for Junior Achievement; a strong supporter of local charities and sports teams; and more recent endeavours have included him chairing the intensive care fund-raising campaign. This incredible project raised \$1.4 million for the Peterborough Civic Hospital's share of the \$4-million project. Since the unit opened last April, it has served over 1,100 patients.

On behalf of my constituents, let me personally congratulate Peter Norris on being named the 1996 Citizen of the Year: a true community worker, a true community spirit, and truly a great citizen.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): There are many Torontonians who have voiced their opposition to Mike Harris's plan for a megacity. None is more eloquent than internationally renowned author and poet Margaret

Atwood, who has spun her own fairy story of modern politics called *The Story of the Little Blue Harris and the Big Bad Megacity*. When the people got "very, very upset," she said, "they jumped up and down and waved signs and made speeches and sang:"

He lied to us, he lied to us
The Big Blue Harris lied to us.

Mr Speaker, I withdraw those remarks on behalf of myself and Margaret Atwood.

Say, can this be common sense?
Or is it common nonsense?

He's screwed our taxes and our rents —

Mr Speaker, I withdraw those remarks on behalf of myself and Margaret Atwood.

And caused a huge unholy fuss!

He wants to take this ill-planned law

And shove it down Toronto's craw.

Oh Big Blue Harris, think it through

Pause and consider, and keep in view

The needs of the citizens, not just you!

To admit you've made a big boo-boo

Is a sign of maturity —

To hear you affirm that you're not God

Will cause us all to cheer and applaud —

The truth will make you free!

Mr Speaker, I couldn't have said it better myself.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : Encore une fois le gouvernement de l'Ontario démontre son insensibilité aux besoins de la communauté francophone. On a vu la semaine passée qu'ils sont en train de fermer l'hôpital Montfort, le seul hôpital francophone de la région.

Aujourd'hui, j'ai reçu une lettre d'André Lalonde, président de l'ACFO, qui lui était envoyée par le ministre de l'Éducation. Imaginez que M. Lalonde, le président de cette association francophone, reçoit une lettre du gouvernement provincial l'invitant d'aller faire partie d'une consultation faisant affaire avec le programme d'apprentissage et, Monsieur le Président, cette lettre est quoi ? Elle est adressée à M. Lalonde, mais elle est écrite en anglais.

On demande très sincèrement au gouvernement qu'ils reconnaissent qu'en Ontario, il y a beaucoup de francophones qui demandent des services en français, et quand le gouvernement envoie des lettres pareilles directement au président de l'ACFO, l'association responsable pour les citoyens de la province, en anglais, ça démontre, franchement, que le gouvernement ne comprend pas et, possiblement, qu'il n'est pas trop sérieux quand ça vient à donner les services en français.

Je pense que cette lettre est un affront à la communauté francophone. Le premier ministre et le ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones doivent se rendre compte qu'il y a des francophones et que l'on veut avoir nos services en français. Faites-le.

HEALTH SERVICES RESTRUCTURING

Mrs Barbara Fisher (Bruce): I believe we all agree there is never adequate funding for health care. As well, the status quo is not serving patients well.

As the member for Bruce, I am proud to represent a community that understands the need for change. In my community, the following parties are participating in the ongoing effort to restructure our health care system: the Grey-Bruce District Health Council and restructuring steering subcommittee; the South Bruce-Grey Health Restructuring Alliance; the doctors, nurses, and other health care providers; and most importantly, the people.

The consumers of health care services in Bruce and Grey are building our solution. We have been able to agree to date on a single governance and administration for 10 hospitals, on fiscal savings and on bed reductions. We are addressing the need for integrated service delivery and are working to provide this as a part of our plan for restructured health care in our community.

Additional new resources do not exist to allow us to stop finding savings in our hospitals before integrating services and implementing reinvestment strategies. These changes must be undertaken concurrently.

Rural health care must be considered differently than urban centres. Of extreme importance are quality care, access and economic considerations. I believe it is important that we all work together to ensure that the final blueprint for health care in our communities and across Ontario is one that provides the highest quality care in the right place at the right time.

I am pleased and proud that the people of Bruce —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much, member. Statements.

TRUCKING SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): After months of delay and dithering, the Minister of Transportation, with all the bluster and fanfare he could muster, at a very public press conference announced the impending tabling of Bill 125, the flying tire act. After sustained questioning and urging by the opposition and dozens of serious accidents and incidents, some involving injury and death, the minister finally, at long last, produced a bill on February 24.

At no time during discussions of the government's legislation and its agenda this year was any reference made to even the potential existence of this bill, let alone its introduction for debate. Never had the bill been placed on the agenda of any House leaders' meeting by the government, yet the minister, with all the fanfare of a circus barker, proclaimed his intention to proceed.

Why, you ask, did the government not call its bill for debate last week? Why, you ask, did the government, if it's so eager to pass this legislation, not make room on its schedule for it this week? The answer is simple: The downloading and dumping of responsibility and costs to municipalities and satisfying the government's developer friends are far more important to the Harris crowd than highway safety.

I challenge Al Palladini to bring the bill forward for debate today, this afternoon. Let's clear the decks and turn the tough talk into tough action. Otherwise, it will be a tale told by an idler full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

1350

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

WOMEN'S ISSUES

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues): In 1912, one year after the first Female Suffrage Day was celebrated, 14,000 women in New York City raised a call for better wages and working conditions. Their courage to speak out on women's rights was a milestone in the women's movement and is the foundation upon which International Women's Week is built.

March 8, 1975, was the first International Women's Day, declared by the United Nations in honour of women's rights to equality and for world peace. This year the Status of Women Canada has chosen the theme Women and Work: Celebrating Diversity.

Women have achieved success in diverse areas and in ways that even in 1975 would have been beyond the general consensus of our society. The women who nearly 85 years ago came together in support of women's rights would be proud of their progressive efforts and the roads they helped pave for the following generations to carry on. To them the fact that there are 700,000 women-led businesses providing 1.7 million jobs in this country would have seemed impossible. To know that women create jobs at three times the national average is an indication of how far we have come.

But we need not go back to the turn of the century to mark significant achievements. In 1975 women accounted for just 5% of medical students; today it is 50%. Women are represented at senior executive levels in every sector and continue to chip away at the glass ceiling that has kept them from reaching their whole potential and ensuring that their voices are heard at every level.

Women-led businesses have understood the need to diversify; they are represented in every industry from mining and construction to finance, insurance and real estate. Clearly, the economic success of women has dramatically improved.

Two priorities of our government aim to advance women's aspirations. The promotion of safe communities and an end to violence against women are plainly linked to the achievement of women's economic independence.

Today I am announcing \$574,000 in grants to organizations around the province that have designed and initiated innovative and creative community-based solutions. These grants are awarded to community groups working on specific projects to eliminate violence against women and strengthen women's economic independence, and we know that the efforts of these groups go a long way in their respective communities.

We have just announced a \$15,000 grant to the Women's Information and Support Centre of Halton. This organization, led by only two staff and over 80 volunteers, recently developed a guide called Eight Steps to Self-Employment, which has received requests from across Canada and has been referred to and referenced as an outstanding tool in helping dozens of women start their own businesses.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I'm pleased to be following the official opposition House leader with my statement because I want to reinforce his comments. I also attend those House leaders' meetings, and I have to tell you, there was never any mention from your government House leader that there would be a bill coming forward on truck safety, although members of both opposition parties asked for such to be brought forward. Then we have the announcement of the important legislation that has to be passed right away. Quite frankly, both opposition parties believe this is important and believe it should be passed right away and believe there should be an opportunity for some public input on that bill.

Because there is a deal which structures the last two weeks of the House and gets bills out for the committees in the intersession, we offered to drop what the government had told us was its lowest priority legislation, the development charges bill, which would be debated today and Wednesday afternoon and have three days of public hearings during the intersession. We thought that would be a perfect match: It was the lowest priority of the government and the time is already set aside. We said, "Call the truck safety bill, call the flying wheel bill today, Monday," and we urge them still to do that.

I think it was most aptly put by my colleague from Cochrane South, who said the government has got its priorities wrong. No one is going to be killed by a flying development charge, but people will be killed by flying truck wheels.

We urge the government: This is a priority for all three parties, so please call the bill today.

SCOUTS CANADA

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I rise in the House today to draw the members' attention to a group of young people in this province who are striving to achieve their full physical, intellectual, social and spiritual potential as Ontarians.

I recently spoke to the scouts in my riding of Simcoe East at the invitation of their leader, Bob Wright. These youths are working on their gold stage, which includes explaining how the provincial government works.

In my meeting with the Simcoe East group, I explained to these young boys and girls the role of an MPP and the Lieutenant Governor, how votes are taken in the House and the role of each party in our government, and I was very impressed by their responsive interest.

Last week, scouting founders Lord and Lady Baden-Powell were recognized by scouting organizations worldwide. Scouts Canada's annual report for 1995-96 recorded an increase in membership. In 1993 co-ed scouting was introduced in many areas of Ontario. This has aided increased membership.

I commend the leaders of these young citizens for donating their time to teach loyalty to one's country, responsibility to one's community and dignity to fellow beings. I have no doubt these scouts of today will be our leaders of tomorrow.

Today my colleague from Perth and I presented a grant of \$24,000 to Women and Rural Economic Development, WRED. As of July 1996, WRED was responsible for 226 business starts with an 85% success rate. They established the rural enterprise loan fund, which allows women who otherwise may not be eligible for credit to receive low-collateral loans to start up new businesses or expand existing ones.

I met with 22 young women just a few weeks ago. They were women entrepreneurs ranging in age from 14 to 18 years. Their high level of enthusiasm was wonderfully evident, and I was pleased to see their determination to ensure that support for entrepreneurialism was encouraged through the secondary school reform. It's something we must do more work on to encourage our teachers and communities to be involved. These young women already know what will be expected of them to succeed and they are taking steps to prepare for their role in the new economy.

The secondary school reform and apprenticeship reform are important initiatives in this regard, as 1994 statistics have shown us that just one in five students in engineering, natural sciences and mathematics is a woman. Today only 3.5% of practising engineers are women and women make up less than 10% of registrants in apprenticeship training. Clearly there is still work to be done.

We can all be proud of the great achievements women have made in our country towards economic self-sufficiency, job creation, and towards the creation of safe communities for all Ontarians.

Today I thank all women of Ontario for the creative and solid solutions they have made work. We continue on our path towards prosperity and a better life. Our daughters and all the generations that follow will benefit from this work and they will make further advancements to levels that may now seem beyond our consciousness. Thank you for this opportunity.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I rise to respond to the statement made by the minister responsible for women's issues, although I must confess that I am puzzled as to why the minister has risen today, and without notice, to make this statement.

It's usually considered significant that we would ask for unanimous consent in the House to recognize International Women's Day, which of course as the minister notes, falls on March 8, and that we would have expected in this House on March 6 to have an all-party recognition of International Women's Day. Normally we would use this opportunity to jointly celebrate women, what women have been able to achieve, and to acknowledge the struggle that women have had in order to make those achievements.

I can agree with the minister as she recognizes some areas of achievement and I can agree with her when she makes the statement that the women who nearly 85 years ago came together in support of women's rights would be proud of their progressive efforts and the roads they helped pave for the following generations to carry on. But I do not believe those women would be proud of what has happened to women in Ontario for the past year and a half under this Conservative government, and I

cannot join in celebrating the achievements of women in this province when I see nothing but the ball rolling back down the hill and women worried about whether they will ever be able to push it up again.

The minister in her statement today has focused on the economic achievements of women, so let me first deal with some of the economic realities for women in Mike Harris's Ontario in 1997, an Ontario in which we have seen downsizing in the public sector as well as in the private sector, but in the public sector to a degree never seen before. It is a recognized reality that those same women who have struggled to achieve some equal representation in the workplace have done so only recently and are the last in and therefore the first out in any downsizing and it affects them disproportionately.

At the same time as those actions were being taken and having the effect on whether women would be employed, we had a government that scrapped the employment equity legislation and has put absolutely nothing in its place so that those women who have not had the opportunity to be part of the workforce are getting no support from their government to be able to achieve that. In fact, one of the key areas where support is needed for women to be full and active participants in the workplace is in child care. What is this government proposing to do on child care? Shift more and more of it on to the municipalities so that this province, this government, has less and less responsibility for ensuring that women have some equal chance.

This is the same government that just last week announced it would take even further steps in a backwards direction on the whole issue of pay equity — pay equity legislation which was simply designed to make sure there would not be discrimination based on gender in the pay received in the workplace. The government has decided in its wisdom that there's no need any longer to give special attention to this issue even though women still make 70% of what men make, so it is going to scrap the Pay Equity Commission and roll that and the appeals tribunal into the Ministry of Labour in preparation for this being a complaints-driven process. How long women struggled to get some recognition of discrimination in pay in the workplace; how quickly this government has said, "We don't need to worry about discrimination any longer," unless the women are so beaten up that they feel they have to come forward and try to make this government hear that there is a problem. How far back does the ball have to roll?

The government started with its 23% cuts to welfare, which we know disproportionately hurt women and their children, and more and more women-led families are living in poverty in 1997 in Mike Harris's Ontario than when this government took office. We have seen absolute chaos in family support, and now the minister responsible for women's issues is complaining that the federal government is going to make it possible for those parents who are providing support to get more support for their children because she's afraid and the Attorney General is afraid it will create even more chaos in Ontario's already chaotic family support program.

We have this statement from a minister who is sitting on a report which says that the focus should not be on

dealing with women who are victims of violence but should shift to the prevention of violence. In that context, I cannot even welcome the announcement of the \$546 million in grants to women's programs because the real fear for women out there, women working in the shelters who have had their funding cut, women working in rape crisis centres, is that what this government is doing is not going to be supportive of their work over the years but will be counterproductive and will in fact replace their expertise.

1400

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): The announcement that the minister made today is a smokescreen for the devastation that she and her government have caused for women across this province since the day they got into office. You've made it far more difficult for women to get into the workforce, for instance, and to advance once they get work. Let's look at your record for a second.

You brought in Bill 7, gutting labour laws which protected some of the lowest-paid women in Ontario and made it almost impossible for these women to organize and improve their lot; your Red Tape Review Commission report says women in workplaces with 100 employees or fewer should get lower wages; and you threw out the proxy method of employment equity, which protected the lowest-paid women in Ontario. Now you're actually getting rid of the Pay Equity Commission, leaving women to fight for themselves, telling them to go to the Human Rights Commission, and I may add, after the fact if they have a complaint. After cancelling employment equity, pay equity, now it looks like you're going to downsize the Human Rights Commission.

You gutted training programs for women on welfare after you cut them by almost 23%, women and their children. You then proceeded to cut the Jobs Ontario Training programs and the child care spaces which went with them without putting a thing in place. You talked in lovely sentences about the new workfare program you were going to put into place. I didn't agree with the philosophy of that, but you haven't done anything to help these women get back in the workplace for training. Women in adult learning centres are terrified that those centres are going to close. They're upgrading their training because of the cuts to education. To date, Minister, there has been a total of 9,000 fewer child care spaces and it looks like more to come.

It's not surprising that the majority of women in this province do not support your government and it's not surprising that it's the majority of women in Metro Toronto who do not support your downloading. More women and children than anybody else depend on all these services that are being downloaded and they know what that means to them.

This is from the announcement the government made today, and let me quote the attitudes that allow the Harris Conservatives to ignore women. Minister, you've gone along with this, and to my knowledge you have not refuted it. You said this yourself: "Women earn less than men because they choose to live their lives in a very different way. They choose to balance work and family." The minister responsible for women's issues in this province said this, and I would like to hear you apologize

for that. Women need to make more money. You are gutting all the programs that will help them advance.

Listen to what your Premier said about child hunger: "There has been no particular link between children hungry in school and the unemployment rates, the welfare rates that are there. Lifestyle changes contributed to it. If you go back 30 or 40 years ago where it seemed to be that mom was in the kitchen with a hot breakfast, cooking as everybody woke up in the morning, that's not the normal situation today."

I'll tell you, Minister, it is not the normal situation. He is quite right and that is not the cause of hunger, of child poverty. The cause is squarely on your shoulders. You sit at that cabinet table. I have not seen you once stand in this House and stand up for women. I have no evidence that you have done so at the cabinet table. Whenever we ask questions to you or any other ministers, you support them and make outrageous statements yourself. What you are doing and what your government is doing to the policies that women have worked hard for over 20, 30 years or more in this province, in one fell swoop you are getting rid of all of them.

Minister, women are aware of it and women want and demand for International Women's Day that you bring back the pay equity and the employment equity laws, that you pull back on Bill 7, repeal it and give women the right to organize again and advance in the workplace.

It is shameful. I have nothing good to say about your record whatsoever. You really should be ashamed of yourself. This is not rhetoric, Minister. This is a very serious problem and I wish you would correct it.

Mrs McLeod: Mr Speaker, may I correct the record?

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Yes.

Mrs McLeod: It's \$574,000. I believe I referred to it in terms of millions.

The Speaker: Corrected.

VISITORS

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce some guests who are here. I know the member for High Park-Swansea will be very interested in this.

I'd like to inform the members of the Legislative Assembly that we have in the Speaker's gallery today a Tasmanian delegation led by the Honourable Ross W. Ginn, MLC, accompanied by Mr Anthony John Benneworth, MP. Welcome.

ORAL QUESTIONS

EDUCATION FINANCING

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): My question is for the Minister of Education. As I hope you're aware, in the committee hearings on your education bill, parent after parent, trustee after trustee has expressed concern about what will happen to students when you take over control of educational finance.

For example, Sam Wales, the chairman of the Board of Education for the City of York, spoke of the needs of students in his area, which has the highest percentage of

low-income families, the largest percentage of parents with less than a grade 9 education, the largest percentage of unemployed and the largest percentage of population that do not have English as their mother tongue.

The Board of Education for the City of York deals with this by offering before- and after-school programs, lunchtime programs, readiness-for-school programs, summer school, enrichment programs, remedial programs, English skills development programs, inclusive curriculum, interpreters, translation, race relations and a strong safe schools initiative. They also offer extensive night-time and daytime programs for adults.

Minister, will you guarantee that all these programs will be continued and all these needs will be met when you —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much. Minister of Education.

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): The member for Fort William asks what will happen when the province finally does what commission after commission and report after report have asked provincial governments in the past to do, and that is to take over the cost of having first-class education right across the province.

What will happen is fairly obvious. We will discontinue the funding of education based solely on what property value is worth in a child's neighbourhood and we'll be funding education based on what those individual children need. We have said time and time again in this chamber, out in communities and right across Ontario that this government is committed to meeting the needs of every individual student and we will spend what it takes to do that.

Mrs McLeod: I say to the minister, listen to what people are trying to tell you at these committee hearings because it's not just people concerned about education in the city of York who are worried; it's people in East York, Scarborough, the city of Toronto, North York and Etobicoke — Etobicoke, where they told us that 30% of their student population are from refugee families and speak no English.

Mostly our committee has heard from parents who are worried that this government wants to cut costs to take everybody's funding down to the lowest common denominator. They're afraid your cuts are going to hurt their kids. When you say there will be no second-class students in Ontario, they're afraid that every student in Ontario will become a second-class student when you take over educational finance.

You have said: "Trust us, we'll be fair," but that is no guarantee the needs of children are going to be met. David Moll, the chair of the Toronto Board of Education —

The Speaker: Question.

Mrs McLeod: This is the question, Mr Speaker — wants to see a children's bill of rights in your legislation. Are you prepared to do more than just say, "Trust us"?

Hon Mr Snobelen: Certainly, this is a government that's been known for keeping its word, and of course we bring that reputation to every conversation, including the conversation —

Interjections.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): The minister was being provocative.

The Speaker: Well, you can be provocative in this place. It's allowable.

1410

Hon Mr Snobelen: Apparently, to the members opposite a government that keeps its word is somewhat startling, but it has been the track record of this government.

What we have done and what we propose to do is to get rid of a funding system where the amount of money available for child education has everything to do with the property value in that local neighbourhood and nothing at all to do with the needs of that individual student. I believe and my colleagues believe that we can recognize those costs, that we can have a system of funding that meets those needs so we can raise the mediocre level of student achievement that our current system is producing. We think Ontario students should be at the front of the class. We think we should be meeting their needs, not a system's needs, and we think that their achievement should be the best in Canada, not the middle of the pack, and that's what we'll do.

Mrs McLeod: If this government protects children the way it has not closed hospitals, then there is no hope for public education in Ontario today.

Minister, even some of the ratepayer associations that your government called as witnesses to the committee are worried about what you intend to do to education. David Vallance of the Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations, for example, says that your create-a-crisis approach will simply not work. He says that you seem to be obsessed with the deal and have paid little attention to what comes next.

The Etobicoke Federation of Ratepayers and Residents Association has said, "Our past credit and support of the present administration for having a game plan is being quickly eroded as forced deadlines and an apparent lack of proper business planning is now being perceived as executing a hidden agenda to privatize education and, worse still, to introduce an American style of education into Canada."

Minister, is this your hidden agenda? You're not protecting kids. Is it your agenda to privatize education and bring in American-style education to Ontario?

Hon Mr Snobelen: I've heard many things said by the member for Fort William in the past, but I have never heard anything that silly from anyone in this chamber in the last two years. That's the silliest statement I have ever heard.

No. What this government will do is take on the challenges of rebuilding an education system for our students. What this government will do — what your government would not do, what the previous government would not do — is take on these issues so we can raise student achievement across this province and so we can make sure that our investment in education makes a difference with student learning. That's what this government is doing, and I and my colleagues —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I caution the members, heckling is out of order. It's particularly difficult, and I ask you to

come to order, when they're answering the questions. Are you finished your response? Just stop the clock for a minute.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Yes, heckling is out of order. That's the standard that's been established for many years.

There are a lot of conversations taking place in the chamber at this point in time, and it's very difficult to hear the questions and answers. I would ask that you cooperate, particularly from the government side. I know there are a lot of meetings taking place.

Interjection.

The Speaker: I didn't mean to disappoint the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, but it is a little discouraging.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism. As one of the senior ministers representing the city of Toronto, I wonder if you'll follow the lead of your courageous colleague from Wentworth North, who supported his city against forced amalgamation. If the majority of citizens in the city of Toronto reject the megacity, will you respect the will of the majority? As their representative in the city of Toronto, where you are the member and a minister, will you do like your colleague from Wentworth North and vote against Bill 103? Will you do that, Minister?

Hon William Saunderson (Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism): I'd like to refer that question to the House leader of the government.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Member for Hamilton East, come to order.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): This is a question that actually should be directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Premier, but as the acting Premier today, I'm more than happy to respond and indicate that this government is more than prepared to listen, this government is always listening. Democracy is a process that takes seven days a week, 24 hours a day, throughout the whole year. The exercise taking place today is one that the government is listening closely to. There are concerns that are being expressed through this process and the government takes all these concerns very seriously.

The Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Yorkview.

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): What you are thinking of, Minister, is just making some minor changes. Let me tell you that you are just talking about rounding the edges with a bill that is totally and fundamentally flawed. You just haven't been listening to what the people have been telling you with respect to Bill 103. They say it is a bad piece of legislation, plain and simple. Let me tell you that this is a turkey and turkeys don't fly and your legislation is not going to fly. Do you know why? Because property taxes are going to skyrocket.

Listen to this quote. "Our research concludes that amalgamation will produce the exact opposite effect of what everyone wants, higher costs and higher taxes."

That's the Canadian Taxpayers Federation speaking. Are you just going to call them another special interest group?

Megacity is your excuse to dump hundreds of millions —

The Speaker: Thank you very much, Minister.

Hon David Johnson: To the member opposite, who is still standing, I would say that this government is most concerned about the level of taxation in Ontario. This government, as part of its key policy during the last provincial election, indicated that taxes are too high in the province, that taxes are too high at the provincial level. We've reduced the provincial income tax by some 15%, with another 15% to come. This government feels that at the municipal level and at the school board level the costs are too high, that government is too complicated and that there's overlap and duplication. This government is looking for solutions not only to reduce provincial taxes, but municipal taxes and taxes associated with schools in the province as well.

The Speaker: final supplementary, the member for Parkdale.

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): If the minister doesn't care about property taxes going through the roof, perhaps he will care about our communities. I want to remind this chamber what the former mayor of East York said. He said, "The traditions of East York should be maintained, and there is no reason to destroy our community, because we are proud of it." Today we know that this whole megacity proposal is aimed at one thing, and that is the destruction of our communities. I say to you today that we want an answer from this government. They say, "We're going to create community councils." We know now it's toothless. It isn't going to work. These are arbitrary boundaries that can never work.

Let me simply ask him this: Is he going to stand up today and say to the citizens of Metro Toronto that this megacity madness —

The Speaker: Member for Parkdale, thank you very much, Minister.

Hon David Johnson: I will stand up and say today that what this bill is about, what this united Toronto is about is to enhance the communities in Metropolitan Toronto, to enhance communities such as Leaside, Swansea, Beaches, Don Mills, Willowdale, High Park, all those lovely communities we have in Metropolitan Toronto today —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Not East York? Mention East York.

Hon David Johnson: East York, Leaside, all of the communities — to actually give them, at the grass-roots level, authority to solve the problems right within their own communities today, and at the same time to make municipal government more effective, more efficient, less costly, and taxes lower.

The Leader of the Opposition has indicated no when questioned whether he would get rid of the united city. The Leader of the Opposition has said no, that if the united city were in place, would he get rid of it, would he scrap it, he said no, because it will be more effective government, more efficient government, with wonderful —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. New question. Leader of the third party.

1420

IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My question is for the Attorney General. It concerns the events that led to the shooting of Dudley George at Ipperwash park. The Attorney General may want to hear this. I want to read from a briefing note on the subject of the occupation of Ipperwash Park dated September 5, 1995, which was prepared for you. The note was released via freedom of information to the George family and their lawyers, and it states: "Occupying group includes women and children. There has been no violence. The OPP will try to speak to the group to get more information."

I've got a copy of the same briefing note, only the copy I have was released much earlier. The copy I have has two additional sentences that weren't blacked out. The sentences say: "It was agreed that ministerial direction should be sought as soon as possible. The committee will be meeting again on September 6." Minister, why was this phrase blacked out of the —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, leader. Attorney General.

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I understand the procedure is that this is vetted by people within the freedom of information office. They make the decision. I can tell you, because I've said it in this Legislature before, that quite simply the passages referred to the idea of the civil injunction being obtained.

Mr Hampton: I don't think that was much of an answer. The fact of the matter is that this is the original briefing note and it's clear it says, "It was agreed that ministerial direction should be sought as soon as possible," yet this is blocked out when it's handed to the lawyers for the George family.

There was another transcript released today and it shows that OPP officer Beauschesne stated, "The first firearm discharged was my own." He's very clear. The OPP were not returning gunfire; the OPP opened fire. There was a deliberate decision to use force to confront the aboriginal people who were occupying Ipperwash Provincial Park.

Every few months new information comes out. Your government doesn't like the new information coming out, but every few months more information comes out. We want to get right to the point. We want you to call a public inquiry so that all the facts can come out together. Will you do that, Attorney General?

Hon Mr Harnick: The Premier has indicated that he has not foreclosed that option as being something that ultimately will be considered. Quite simply there has been an SIU investigation. Charges have been laid. There is a case before the court and it would be inappropriate to have any further discussion.

Mr Hampton: You could stand in your place and say that as soon as the criminal proceedings are over, there will be a full public inquiry. That's what people want to have so all the information comes out.

I'll continue reading briefing notes. This is another briefing note. It is a handwritten briefing note that we have obtained. It is dated September 6, the day of the shooting, and this is what it says: "No visible weapons. No immediate public safety risk." That's it.

Can you tell me, if that is the briefing note on September 6, why did your government preside over having the OPP riot squad, OPP snipers, and OPP camouflaged tactical units called in? Why, if that's the briefing note, did you preside over having the snipers, the tactical squad and the riot squad there?

Hon Mr Harnick: Again, those are all issues that pertain very much to the investigation the SIU has completed. It relates to the fact that the SIU has laid charges, that there are charges before the court, and those matters will be dealt with before the court.

MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My second question is also to the Attorney General. It concerns a slightly different matter. He is the chief law officer of the crown. As he will know, the cities in Metropolitan Toronto have been trying to use a law that this government passed, Bill 86, to conduct a referendum. Members of your government have continued to say that you'll ignore the referendum, that it is not a worthwhile exercise, that it's undemocratic.

As the chief law officer of the crown, I wonder if you could tell us why, then, you have voted in the referendum?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Mr Speaker, I am going to refer that to the Chair of Management Board.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): Oh, come on. How can you refer that? You were asked why you voted. How can someone else tell us why you voted?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, first of all I'd like to say that there is a protocol in this House that questions pertaining to a ministry go to the minister in charge. In this case Municipal Affairs and Housing is the ministry. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is not here. Accordingly, it would either be the Premier or his designate who would field that question.

In this case I'm happy to say that we hope all the people who are eligible do vote and participate in this process.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): Why bother? You said you wouldn't listen.

Hon David Johnson: The government has indicated, on the contrary, that it is listening. The government indicates that it listens to all forms of input on this question and every other question. I might say, as a person who's been elected for a number of years, that kind of input comes 24 hours a day, seven days a week throughout the full year. Yes, the government is listening to this particular referendum and will take the considerations expressed seriously.

Mr Hampton: Since the minister is answering, or trying to answer, let me ask him a couple of more questions.

It is a fact that you and your colleagues have been saying all along that this process is invalid, yet the phone-in ballots and the mail-in ballots are specifically allowed in your legislation, Bill 86, that you passed just last December. Also, the voters' list is compiled by you, the province. It's your process and it's your voters' list.

We also understand that the chief government whip has voted and we understand that the Premier has voted. Minister, if your government doesn't care about the referendum, if in your view this is a completely wrongheaded process, why are all the heads of your government going out to vote?

Hon David Johnson: I'm delighted to say that I have voted as well in this process. Obviously, your intelligence hasn't picked that up yet, but I'm delighted to say that I voted.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order. Both sides, please come to order.

Mr Douglas B. Ford (Etobicoke-Humber): Peter Kormos couldn't be watching all those —

The Speaker: Member for Etobicoke Humber. Thank you. I am the Speaker.

1430

Hon David Johnson: Obviously certain flaws have been pointed out with regard to this referendum. In my own riding, for example, about 100 ballots were found, which could have been opened up, could have been filled in by anybody in particular, could have been sent back in and registered against somebody else. That's one situation. Apparently a seven-year-old and an 11-year-old got a ballot; I understand somebody living in Stoney Creek got a ballot. There have been various problems associated with this referendum.

Having said that, the fact that ineligible people have received a ballot, that some ballots have gone astray, that there are a number of issues that are being voted on —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. The members for Beaches-Woodbine, Dovercourt, Fort York, Hamilton Centre and Cochrane South, please come to order.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): Is that one riding, Speaker?

The Speaker: No, it's not one riding; it's about five ridings. I'd appreciate it if you all come to order.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): It used to be.

The Speaker: It will be under redistribution possibly but right now it's a lot, so would you please come to order.

Hon David Johnson: Obviously there are problems with this referendum, but at the same time people are going to participate, and I will assure you that the government is listening. The government will analyse the results, will attempt to understand the message that's being sent and will take it seriously.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr Hampton: I want to inform the government House leader again, it's your voters' list; it's not the municipalities' voters' list. If anybody is inept here, if anybody is incompetent here, it is your government. It's your voters' list, it's your legislation they're attempting to use, and you have botched it.

But there's a more important point here. When the Premier turns out to vote and the chief government whip —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Members for Fort York and York Mills.

Mr Pouliot: Do we let people like that vote?

The Speaker: Member for Lake Nipigon.

Mr Hampton: When the Premier turns out to vote and the Attorney General and the government whip, it's clear that this government does care about this referendum and how it turns out. It's clear that you know it will be a real expression of the will of the people of Metropolitan Toronto. So let me ask you the next natural question: You voted in the election. Will you abide by the results?

Hon David Johnson: First of all, I would remind the leader of the third party that it is not an election, but people have had the opportunity to participate. I will say once again that this government is listening. That's right, this government is listening to this referendum and the government is looking for the messages coming out of this referendum.

There will be a number of messages. One will have to do with the one city concept; a second will have to do with the transfer of powers between the municipalities in the province; a third might have to do with education. There will be a number of concerns expressed, and perhaps first and foremost will be the concern of people that taxes may go up.

But I can assure you that this government is intent that all taxes go down, at the municipal level, at the provincial level. We are listening and we will respond accordingly after we've had an opportunity to analyse the results.

IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question is to the Attorney General and it has to do with the shooting of the aboriginal at Ipperwash Provincial Park, a tragic situation, the first time in 100 years that a first nations person was killed in a land dispute.

The minister will know that the first nations were there because they believed there was a sacred burial ground. The government has denied that's the reason they were there. The minister will know that the Premier has said he has no records in his office around key meetings in spite of the fact that his own executive assistant day after day after day was at those meetings. The minister will know that the local member was at the police command post faxing faxes to the Premier with his intentions.

There are serious unanswered questions that the government can only answer through a public inquiry. There is overwhelming evidence of the need for that. You said in an earlier response that the Premier hasn't ruled out a public inquiry. That's not good enough. We want to know today from you, Minister, will you commit to a full public inquiry on this tragic Ipperwash situation?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Certainly, as I indicated earlier, that is not something that has been ruled out. There are charges now before the court as a result of an SIU investigation and certainly the prudent thing to do is

to wait until those charges are disposed of and the court hears the case before any further commitments are made.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): Don't dance around it. Answer the question.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The member for Algoma, come to order, please.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Cochrane South, it would be a little more helpful if you were in your own seat. The member for Cochrane South, I've just asked you to stop heckling. The member for Cochrane South, I'm warning you to come to order. The member for Lambton as well.

Mr Phillips: That answer is not good enough. There are serious charges that in fact go right into the Premier's office. One can only conclude because the government refuses to call for a public inquiry — we understand it may have to await the trials and we would accept that. There's no question of that. We'll do nothing to jeopardize fair trials. But as long as the government refuses to call for a public inquiry — and I will say that the Premier saying he has no record in his office of this is unbelievable, incredible. Nobody can believe that.

I will say that you stood in the House, Attorney General, and said the natives didn't go in there because of the burial ground, when the day before they went in and the day before that in the papers it was spelled out they were in there. The government has no reason for not calling a public inquiry other than a coverup. I repeat today: Will you, on behalf of the government, make a commitment for a full public inquiry on this Ipperwash tragedy?

Hon Mr Harnick: It's wrong to say that this is an issue involving a coverup. Nothing could be so wrong as to come to that conclusion when there are serious charges laid by an independent police watchdog agency that are at present before the courts. Certainly the courts should be able to dispose of these matters and deal with them without any other issue being before any kind of body while such serious charges are outstanding. Certainly the courts will deal with this in an independent way and they will deal with it as a result of the charges that were laid by the independent police watchdog.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS REVIEW

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): My question is for the Minister of Health. On October 2 to the estimates committee you indicated that you planned to expand programs in public health and community health care to emphasize prevention in the health ministry. But, Minister, I have a memo here from the chief medical officer of health of Ontario to all medical officers of health clearly stating that the program review for mandatory public health programs is being speeded up to meet the Who Does What legislative time lines.

There are two startling revelations in the memo. First, when your government announced that it would download full funding of public health units on to the property tax, you said nothing about eroding mandatory programs. Second, while many medical officers of health knew there was a mandatory program review, no one had any idea your government was going to open up the act.

We know that municipalities are clamouring for flexibility, which is a code word for downgrading standards, because you've downloaded a billion more than you've taken from the education thing. Minister, what are you intending to do with the Health Protection and Promotion Act?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I had the privilege of watching part of the press conference that the NDP had today. I had no idea what they were talking about and don't think they have any idea what they're talking about.

The mandatory health programs, and these are them here, folks, were last reviewed in 1988, and in April 1989 this booklet was put out. The chief medical officer of health, who I think is held in deep respect by all members of this House, Dr Richard Schabas, has initiated a review of the mandatory programs at the request of the local boards of health. It's time to update the programs and recognize the growing and aging population.

1440

Mrs Boyd: It's very interesting that you say that, Minister, because your ministry confirmed through a phone call to them today that the mandatory program guidelines have been rewritten and they refused to release them because apparently it hadn't been decided yet who gets to actually see this rewrite. This download of yours goes against all the evidence and all the expert advice that you've had from the Crombie commission. AMO has told you, even your own Health Services Restructuring Commission told you, not to download the funding for public health services on to the municipalities.

There's a great deal at stake. It is clear from Dr Schabas's letter that they are being forced to speed up to meet a legislative timetable that has to do with the who-knows-what legislation. There's a great deal at stake. We're talking about disease control, sanitation, health education, family planning, AIDS prevention, nutrition, and it goes on and on. If you let go of the good standards that have been developed in public health, you'll not only be buying higher health costs for Ontario but you'll be destroying the public health of this province.

Minister, will you commit today that you are not planning to open up this act?

Hon Mr Wilson: We're going to listen very carefully to the public health units themselves, to the experts in public health, to those who push for an increase in prevention programs. I think that's our job, and that's the review that's going on now. It's a natural review that should take place every few years. That's what's going on, and the fact of the matter is that regardless of who pays for the service, the government of Ontario will always set the standards, and we have very high public health standards in this province. In fact, we've pumped millions of new dollars into public health as we've been out doing the inoculations and the vaccination programs, which is the first time in many years the public health units have seen any new money at all.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

M. Gilles E. Morin (Carleton-Est): Ma question, Monsieur le Président, est pour le ministre de l'Agricul-

ture. J'ai participé en fin de semaine à des démonstrations auxquelles des milliers de Franco-Ontariens se sont ralliés à la cause de Montfort. Vous savez fort bien, Monsieur le Ministre, que votre gouvernement se cache derrière la commission de restructuration afin de se défaire des responsabilités qui lui incombent.

La période de 30 jours pour interjeter appel n'est pas une excuse, n'est pas une embûche, pour que votre gouvernement peut se décider maintenant à rejeter la décision de la commission de fermer Montfort, le seul centre d'entraînement hospitalier en Ontario.

Pourquoi ne dites-vous pas à tous les résidents d'Ottawa, de la province, de la nation, que vous prendrez toutes les mesures nécessaires pour vous assurer que Montfort reste en place, que vous éduquerez tous vos collègues au Cabinet à mieux connaître, à mieux comprendre les problèmes auxquels les Franco-Ontariens ont fait face et que jamais, jamais, une telle situation, un tel affront, se présentera ?

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Minister?

L'hon Noble A. Villeneuve (ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones): Merci, Monsieur le Président. La question décolle entièrement des services de santé. Elle n'a aucune chose à faire avec ni l'agriculture, ni l'Office des affaires francophones. Alors, j'aimerais demander à mon collègue le ministre de la Santé à soumettre la réponse.

The Speaker: Minister of Health.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Morin: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I said the Minister of Agriculture, but he knew very well what I meant was the minister responsible for francophone affairs. There's no reason whatsoever to transfer this to the Minister of Health. My question is to the minister for francophone affairs.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Point of order.

The Speaker: I've got a point of order here. Is it the same point of order?

Ms Lankin: Yes, Mr Speaker. I believe it is normal parliamentary procedure when a member begins to respond to a question that he can then not refer it in the middle of it. The minister obviously began to respond to the question.

The Speaker: There was no response in his comments. I appreciate what you're saying, and it was 20 seconds it took to refer it, but he was referring it the whole time.

Okay, the point of order: I appreciate what the member for Carleton East's point of order is, except there is nothing to compel a minister to answer a question. They can refer a question, considering the issue and how they deem it would be best answered. It's completely up to them and I don't have control to force anyone to ask or to answer a question.

Mr Morin: Mr Speaker, you know too well I will respect your judgement. I know too well what your responsibilities are, but when you listened attentively to what the Minister of Agriculture has said, I can assure you that what he said —

The Speaker: I appreciate the comments. The minister had the opportunity to answer the question. He's decided it is best to refer the question, and I can't overrule that, so — what are you up on?

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Clearly you would know as well as I know that this question was directed to the minister in his capacity as minister for francophone affairs. If he won't stand up for the francophones of this province, then who the heck is going to?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): We set up the Health Services Restructuring Commission to take this sort of politics out of the health care system, and that's why we got —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Minister of Health.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Oriole, come to order. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: The important thing in the restructuring of the system and certainly the important thing in the minds of the commission and the commissioners is access to health services. In this case, the honourable member asks about access to French-language services, and again I will remind the honourable member that it isn't buildings that provide service; it's people. Many of those people who work at the Montfort Hospital now will find jobs at the other hospitals in town and will continue to be able to provide French-language services.

In Ottawa-Carleton, the Ottawa General, the Royal Ottawa rehab centre and St Vincent pavilion are fully designated under the French Language Services Act, as are parts of the children's hospital, the Civic and the Royal Ottawa psych hospital facility and also the heart institute. The importance is that we maintain and enhance French-language services —

The Speaker: Supplementary.

M. Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa-Est): Au ministre des Affaires francophones : Monsieur le Ministre, SOS Montfort, vous le connaissez très bien. Vous êtes le défenseur ; vous êtes l'ambassadeur de la francophonie en Ontario.

Ma question est courte, très à point : Allez-vous dénoncer la fermeture du seul hôpital enseignant, l'hôpital Montfort ? Oui ou non ?

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. It matters not. The question is to the Minister of Health. The supplementary goes to the same minister who had the —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Member for Yorkview, thank you for your help, but I understand what the rule is. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: I'll repeat my answer to the previous question. The important thing is services. We are dealing with, I say to the honourable member, a \$2-billion cut from Ottawa in terms of the money we have available to spend on health, and I think members of all three parties at least are on record of agreeing there's need to restructure and reform the system, concentrate all of our dollars not on buildings but on services. We want to see modern hospitals with the newest technology and the newest drug

therapies. We want to do that, and the commission wants to do that, in a way that's also sensitive to the language needs of the francophones in Ontario.

The commission went to great pains in its interim report to ensure that French-language services are in place today and that they will be in the future. That's what we all should be working towards.

Mr Grandmaître: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: When will this government appoint a minister responsible for —

The Speaker: That's not a point of order.

1450

INVESTIGATION INTO POLICE SHOOTING

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I have a question for the Attorney General. Last week I attended a community forum about Edmond Yu who was, as you know, recently fatally shot by the police. Unfortunately, this was not the first tragic incident of this kind. Last year Faraz Suleman was fatally shot in Markham and Tony Barnett in Toronto.

The Chinese community and others express real concern that Bill 105 gives police chiefs much more power to investigate complaints brought by civilians. How can they have faith in the process while police chiefs do not remain neutral when a police officer is being investigated? Chief Boothby has already spoken out in support of the police officers, before the investigation in this case. Will you withdraw Bill 105 and establish a truly independent, community-based civilian body to investigate and monitor all police complaints, regardless of the seriousness of the complaint?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): The case to which the honourable member refers is a case that, as I understand, is being investigated by the special investigations unit. That is an independent body that investigates these kinds of cases, and in fact that is what is being done in this case. That's an independent investigatory body. There have been no changes to the way that body works, and they are performing the investigation in the case to which the member refers.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Supplementary, member for Fort York.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): I participated this Saturday in a demonstration to mourn and decry the death of Edmond Yu. I have to tell you there was incredible solidarity among the many different communities that were there and there were over 300 people on a wet Saturday afternoon.

The anger was palpable. They were saying that 20 community groups were shut out of the process or prior to the process of dealing with Bill 105 — shamefully left out of the process. They said that the civilian monitoring of the complaints process is being significantly reduced, shifting the oversight into the hands of the police chief.

Two things come out of this: One, the supporters of the late Edmond Yu want the special investigations unit to produce a report that is accessible for everyone to read. They demand that.

The Speaker: Question.

Mr Marchese: Finally, they all demanded the elimination of Bill 105.

Hon Mr Harnick: I will reiterate again that the investigation that the SIU does is an independent investigation, and that in fact is taking place in this case. In so far as Bill 105 is concerned, it's before a legislative committee now, I believe. The public will have an opportunity again to make representations to the committee, as they had an opportunity to make representations to Mr McLeod, who prepared a study for the Solicitor General. Certainly I hope that the community avails themselves of the opportunity to make those submissions and I know that the Solicitor General will be listening and making improvements to the bill that he deems worthwhile.

MINISTRY STUDY

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): We don't have one.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Member for Windsor-Sandwich, come to order, please.

Interjection.

The Speaker: I want to warn you to come to order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Member for Durham East, I appreciate your help.

Mr Galt: Minister, I understand you've commissioned a study to examine the delivery of services from your ministry to the clients, primarily the food producers of Ontario. Some critics have suggested the study is a front for some ulterior motive. Why are you carrying out this study?

Hon Noble Villeneuve (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs): The question is very timely because as colleagues —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Member for Hamilton East, come to order. Member for Cochrane North. Thank you.

Hon Mr Villeneuve: The question is very timely because we are very proud of the staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and they have done a top-notch job in serving Ontario agriculture. You may have also heard that the agriculture business in Ontario is a \$50-billion business employing 650,000 people. That is why we have initiated a comprehensive study. Dr Frank Ingratta and Dr Terry Deynard are both in charge to better deliver extension service to the farmers and agrifood producers of Ontario. Their study will be due very shortly. That is why this has occurred.

Mr Galt: Obviously, the study is doing a fine job as you examine and go out with extensive consultation to ensure that the services are improved. Minister, could you tell us when this study will be finished and how the results will be used?

Hon Mr Villeneuve: The study and the report will be in by the middle of March, the middle of this month. It won't be gathering any dust. It will be implemented very shortly. This government has to do more with less. Remember, when the agrifood sector does well, all of Ontario benefits.

HEALTH SERVICES RESTRUCTURING COMMISSION

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North): My question is for the Minister of Health. Minister, for some months now you, Mr Johnson your predecessor at the Ministry of Health, and Premier Harris, among others, have said you've created the Health Services Restructuring Commission to take the politics out of hospital restructuring. You confirm published reports this past weekend that before the delay in the Sarnia-Lambton restructuring decision the so-called non-political Health Services Restructuring Commission met with the Progressive Conservative caucus?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): Yes. At that time, I remember asking Duncan Sinclair — I wasn't back at work as Minister of Health then, but I was an MPP, so I went to that meeting. They invited all three caucuses, to give a briefing. It was a very generic briefing about what their mandate is. They were asked that night and they made it clear that, yes, they'd made the same offer to all three caucuses. Our caucus said yes because we're interested in what the commission is doing. I understand subsequently they met with at least the critic and possibly the leader of the NDP to give a similar briefing. I don't know whether the Liberal Party has taken them up on that offer or not.

Mr Conway: I want to be clear. Before the Sarnia-Lambton decision was delayed a week ago today, and before the government decided it would stay all rural hospital restructuring pending a Ministry of Health directive on new guidelines for the restructuring of rural hospitals, before all that happened, the Sinclair commission met quietly with the government caucus. That has now been confirmed to the House by Minister Wilson.

Minister, what do you have to say to the mayors of cities like Sarnia, Brockville, Pembroke, Sudbury and Thunder Bay, who have heard about what happened 10 days ago in the Tory caucus, that perhaps the politics has not been taken out of hospital restructuring, that perhaps it's the good old boys in the Progressive Conservative world who have had some kind of special access that seems to have produced benefits for Tory ridings not available to the rest of us?

Hon Mr Wilson: I'm tempted to say, "I wish," but the fact of the matter is, phone up Dr Duncan Sinclair or any of his commissioners and ask them what briefing they gave. Frankly, go and have a briefing with them, because what they're doing out there is extremely important to the future of health care in this province and extremely important to all your constituents.

1500

FRANCHISE BUSINESSES

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with responsibility for small business. He knows that I've been on my feet in this House about four times over the last year, talking about franchise legislation, both introducing my own legislation supporting a member's private bill from the Liberal caucus and asking you when you were going to introduce legislation concerning the franchise

industry. Each of those times we had people in the gallery and out there who are about to lose their stores and who since have.

Today we have in the gallery a woman from Sault Ste Marie, Mary Carlucci, who is about to lose her store. She belongs to the National Grocers chain. Will you, Minister, today tell us when you are going to bring to this House for approval your pending legislation on the franchise industry in this province?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): The member will appreciate, and I've been keeping him abreast as we've gone along, that we have been exercising consultation and consensus building within the industry. He'll also know that the Franchise Sector Working Team, which was formed in 1994 by his government with the intention of consultation with both franchisers and franchisees to come up with a balanced piece of legislation, was clearly something that we recognized was important.

The franchise industry as a whole recognizes that there are a number of things they need, a code of ethics, disclosure requirements etc. When we come forward with it, which I imagine will be very shortly, I have also offered the member the opportunity to meet with him and to brief him on the matter. But I will remind the member that his government certainly had much time to deal with this. Back in 1993 when Marilyn Churley was in my position, she indicated, "If, when the Liberals were in power, they had moved ahead with legislation, possibly the problem we're looking at now wouldn't be happening," yet in the two years after that, she did nothing. So we are moving ahead.

Mr Martin: Talk is cheap. Minister, you're the government now.

Mary Carlucci is going to lose her store in about 30 days, and she wants this legislation in right away, today, tomorrow, when you get the time to bring it forward. Mary Carlucci says, "All along I thought hard work and dedication would pay off." This is the party, this is the government that says it stands up for business and for small business in this province. I ask you today, when are you going to bring this legislation forward, and more than that, will you today launch an investigation into the delivery of food in this province? The seriousness and the scope and the number of small business people in this province who have a difficulty with that industry, with their franchisers, is growing with each day that goes by. Will you bring in legislation, and will you investigate this industry?

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: I might say something to the member. What we're trying to come forward with is balanced, workable legislation, and the reason we've taken the time to consult with the industry, both the franchisers and franchisees, is to come forward with something very balanced.

I know the member has a keen interest, and I do recognize that, because the member brought forward a private member's bill, but I might remind the member that several members of the official opposition voted against his bill as well because it lacked the balance really needed to correct the problems within the industry.

We're coming forward with this very quickly. We have had to do the consultations. Once again I must comment that we want balanced, workable legislation that will work for everyone and create an atmosphere of fairness to support the growth of this industry within the province.

COURT BACKLOG

Mr Jim Brown (Scarborough West): My question is for the Attorney General. Everyone is aware that in 1990, 50,000 cases were dismissed because they went beyond the eight-month deadline to come to trial. That trend continued under the former NDP government. The courthouse in my riding, on Eglinton Avenue East, had a very large backlog and my constituents are worried about the high crime rate. They're worried that criminals will be set free unpunished. What is your ministry doing about this problem?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I'm pleased to respond to the member for Scarborough, because what we are doing is increasing the number of cases that are resolved at an early stage. We've exceeded our targets. We are now resolving cases early at the rate of 73.2%. The trial rate is down from 9% to 8.5%. Cases are proceeding through the system more quickly.

I can tell you the Liberals had 50,000 cases dismissed as a result of their inactivity. During the NDP years, from 1993, 1994 and 1995, they were losing about 2,500 cases a year that were stayed. In 1996, for the first time, this course was reduced; just over 2,200 cases were stayed. With the backlog blitz that is now going, we anticipate that we will continue to reduce this number and continue to ensure all serious cases are being tried.

Mr Jim Brown: Minister, my constituents are really worried. You announced a backlog blitz in the Eglinton Avenue East courthouse. My constituents want to know how effective it has been to date.

Hon Mr Harnick: The backlog blitz we've begun is already seeing positive results. We launched this blitz in the six worst locations with backlog problems. We've appointed over 40 government officials, including 25 crown attorneys, to the project at a cost of between \$1 million and \$2 million. We are now seeing good results.

In Scarborough we're now setting trial dates within four months of the person's first appearance. This is down from seven months when the blitz began. In Newmarket we're now setting trial dates within three months instead of seven months.

I can tell you that because of the work the crown attorney has done in Scarborough, the number of appearances to get a case to trial has been cut almost in half. This is freeing up court time for other cases so that we are seeing —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): New question; the member for Kingston and The Islands.

LONG-TERM CARE

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): My question is to the Minister of Health. A number of homes for the aged have had to take the drastic step of no longer admitting some of the frailest and elderly senior citizens

in our community because of lack of provincial funding. In the home operated in my own community only 14 of the 147 residents can feed themselves, with an average age of 90 years of age. The staff has been cut down by 23 full-time equivalents over the last two years.

Minister, when are you actually going to redirect some of the hospital savings you have found into some of these long-term-care facilities? When can the communities and these boards expect that kind of funding so these kinds of situations will not recur?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I say to the honourable member that I was disappointed in a motion that was passed by his city council which said they wouldn't take any more high-needs patients into their homes for the aged.

I would point out two things that perhaps the council should reflect upon. One is that the formula was changed to levels-of-care funding about 18 months ago so that the greater the needs of the patient, the more dollars the home gets to look after that patient. Maybe we need to remind councillors of that.

Second, I don't see the over 300 private sector nursing homes in the province that have always taken high-needs patients complaining. It's now time for a level playing field and for the municipal homes for the aged no longer to be protected by special agreements and union contracts cooked up by the NDP. It's time they took their share also, and the funding is there to reflect it.

What are we doing with money? Today \$2.5 million into Thunder Bay in anticipation of their restructuring, and that's before we have any customers for long-term care in that area, because there are no waiting lists in that area, so we're —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Minister of Health.

PETITIONS

CHILD CARE

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): I have a petition to the assembly of Ontario and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Ontario Tory government has decided to replace our current child care system with one that lacks compassion and common sense and is fraught with many dangerous consequences; and

"Whereas the concept of affordable, accessible and quality child care is a basic, important, fundamental right for many members of our community who are either unemployed and enrolled into a training program or are working single parents or where both parents are working; and

"Whereas if our present provincial government is sincere in getting people back to work, they should recognize the value of the child care component of the Jobs Ontario program and acknowledge the validity of the wage subsidy to the child care workers;

"We, therefore, the undersigned residents, business owners and child care workers of our Parkdale and High Park communities, urge the Progressive Conservative government of Ontario to immediately suspend their plans

to implement cuts to our present child care programs across our province, and restore funding to their previous levels."

I have affixed my signature.

1510

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I have tons more petitions from my riding about the megacity. This petition reads:

"Citizens Have the Democratic Right to Be Heard on Megacity.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas 'bigger government is not better' and the Mike Harris government has no right to dictate a megacity upon the citizens of Metro Toronto; and

"Whereas the megacity is being imposed on 2.3 million citizens of Metro Toronto without giving people a voice in the future of their cities and neighbourhoods; and

"Whereas Bill 103 puts municipal councils in Metro Toronto under trusteeship, ending local democracy; and

"Whereas the megacity could lead to mega property tax increases, mega user fees and mega cuts in services; and

"Whereas the Tories never proposed abolishing local government in favour of bigger government during the election campaign. In fact, they pledged to do the opposite;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"Give the 2.3 million people in Metro Toronto a say in the future of their cities. Stop the imposition of a megacity and stop the undemocratic takeover of our cities by non-elected trustees."

I affix my signature to this petition.

MACASSA LODGE

Mr Trevor Pettit (Hamilton Mountain): I'm honoured to have this opportunity today to present a petition to the House containing close to 7,000 signatures and the support of the regional government of Hamilton-Wentworth with regard to the reinstatement of funding for capital renovations at Macassa Lodge, a long-term care facility in my riding high atop Hamilton Mountain. The petition reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We, the residents, friends and supporters of Macassa Lodge urge and strongly request that the provincial government honour their commitment and reinstate the \$8.5 million as their share towards the final phase of renovations at Macassa Lodge."

I wholeheartedly support this petition and proudly affix my signature to it.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North): "Speed, experience and teamwork save lives. Don't get burned by Bill 84." This is a petition.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I affix my signature with hundreds of people who support this.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have still further petitions attacking this government for its attack on the Occupational Health and Safety Act of this province.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Harris government has begun a process to open the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario; and

"Whereas this act is the single most important piece of legislation for working people since it is designed to protect our lives, safety and health while at work and allow us to return home to our families in the same condition in which we left; and

"Whereas the government has made it clear they intend to water down the act and weaken the rights of workers under the law, including the right to know, the right to participate, and especially the right to refuse unsafe work; and

"Whereas this government has already watered down proper training of certified committee members;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario not to alter the Occupational Health and Safety Act or erode the rights of workers any further and ensure strict enforcement of the legislation."

I proudly add my name to theirs.

CLASS SIZE

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the private member's bill introduced by Rick Bartolucci which promotes smaller class sizes passed second reading; and

"Whereas this bill, called Bill 110, was referred to the social development committee; and

"Whereas we, the stakeholders in education, want the government committee to hear what we have to say about smaller class sizes; and

"Whereas we want to hear what the government committee has to say regarding smaller class sizes; and

"Whereas all people in Ontario have a right to speak to the social development committee about smaller class sizes;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support the recommendation that the social development committee travel across Ontario to find out what the students, parents, teachers and taxpayers of Ontario are saying about smaller class sizes and Bill 110, the smaller class sizes act."

I affix my signature to the thousands of petitions I have here.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I have hundreds more signatures from my riding on Bill 104. This reads:

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Mike Harris and John Snobelen promised to give Ontario students a better education and to make the education system more accountable; and

"Whereas there is nothing in Bill 104 or in prior bills to indicate how or whether the education of Ontario students will improve; and

"Whereas Bill 104 severely undermines an important level of local democratically elected representation; and

"Whereas Bill 104 allows the government to appoint an Education Improvement Commission with sweeping powers that reports to the Minister of Education; and

"Whereas the fact that Bill 104 states that the decisions of the Education Improvement Commission are 'final and shall not be reviewed or questioned by a court' indicates a severe lack of regard for democracy; and

"Whereas the radical change to the structure of the education system called for in Bill 104 and the undue speed with which the government is attempting to pass and implement Bill 104 indicate a severe lack of regard for democracy; and

"Whereas democracy is the system that makes government accountable;

"We, the undersigned, demand that the government withdraw Bill 104."

I affix my signature to this petition.

SERVICES FOR ABUSED WOMEN

Mr Dave Boushy (Sarnia): I have a petition signed by 1,500 people in regard to the McGuire consultant's report and it reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, demand that the following recommendations proposed in the report not be accepted. We don't accept that battered women stay in shelters for less than 48 hours to then return home with a restraining order that bans their spouse from the premises as their only protection. We don't agree with the proposal that neighbours be told about a family's history of abuse and asked to phone police if there are breaches of restraining orders. We do not support the marrying of rape crisis centres, which offer counselling for women who may or may not decide to go to police about an assault, with medical treatment centres that are geared to collecting evidence for prosecutions. Only 10% to 15% of sexual assaults are reported to the police. Adult survivors of sexual assault and sexual abuse deserve the right to have the option of seeking assistance from confidential, less public organizations like the current rape crisis centres. We do not accept that the government consider not prosecuting men who beat their wives, because it can increase the potential for future abuse, does not necessarily help the victim and is expensive for the taxpayer.

"We, the staff, board of directors and volunteers of the Sexual Assault Survivors Centres Sarnia-Lambton, are appalled by the above recommendations. It is a travesty and tragedy for all women and children. We're asking for your support in this effort to join together and demand that our provincial government maintain the current

services as they exist and provide safe and adequate programs for the women and children of our community."

I sign my signature to that.

NORTH YORK BRANSON HOSPITAL

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee has recommended that North York Branson Hospital merge with York-Finch hospital; and

"Whereas this recommendation will remove emergency and inpatient services currently provided by North York Branson Hospital, which will seriously jeopardize medical care and the quality of health for the growing population which the hospital serves, many being elderly people who in numerous cases require treatment for life-threatening medical conditions;

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reject the recommendation contained within the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee as it pertains to North York Branson Hospital, so that it retains, at minimum, emergency and inpatient services."

I've affixed my signature.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have a petition on behalf of firefighters in the province of Ontario.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I proudly add my name to theirs.

CLASS SIZE

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the private member's bill introduced by Rick Bartolucci, MPP for the riding of Sudbury, limits the number of pupils that may be enrolled in a class in a school in Ontario; and

"Whereas this limit depends on the grade level of the class; and

"Whereas studies have concluded that there are clear benefits from smaller class sizes; and

"Whereas there is greater student involvement and interaction; and

"Whereas there is improved student performance; and

"Whereas there is the opportunity for greater individualization; and

"Whereas smaller class sizes allow for more varied and constructive education for students;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support this private member's bill" — which is now at third reading — "as it enhances classroom education."

I affix my signature in support of those signatures from the riding of York South.

1520

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): This petition is directly related to the private member's motion which was passed in the House last Thursday.

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cut to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to call on the Conservative government to stop the cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must fund hospitals with a funding formula that reflects demographic and regional needs. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

I affix my signature and hope the Health minister will listen.

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I have a petition addressed to the Legislature of Ontario.

"Whereas the Harris government is proposing detrimental changes to education services in Ontario;

"Whereas the government's obsession with the fiscal bottom line will result in a reduction of the quality of education services for our children;

"Whereas inclusive and open consultation on education reform has not taken place;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario reconsider its direction in terms of education policy and that they halt any further changes to the education system until a thorough and inclusive review has taken place."

I concur with the petitioners and I will affix my signature to it.

BIBLIOTHÈQUES PUBLIQUES

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Prescott and Russell): J'ai ci une pétition qui nous provient des Amis de la bibliothèque du canton de Russell aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

«Étant donné que nous croyons fermement que la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en Ontario est un droit fondamental de tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes ;

«Nous, les soussignés, demandons aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario de sauvegarder la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en s'assurant de maintenir ce qui suit :

«(1) Les subventions provinciales qui permettent d'assurer à tous les Ontariens et à toutes les Ontariennes

un accès équitable aux documents et aux services de bibliothèque publique ;

«(2) La coordination des programmes de partage des ressources tels que le système de prêt entre bibliothèques et l'accès au réseau Internet ;

«(3) Une politique permettant d'assurer l'existence du réseau des bibliothèques publiques de l'Ontario ;

«(4) L'aide directe de la part du gouvernement provincial au niveau du service, par exemple par l'entremise du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario-Sud et du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario du Nord ;

«(5) Une loi maintenant l'autonomie des conseils d'administration des bibliothèques publiques.»

J'y appose ma signature.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Orders of the day.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order on orders of the day, Mr Speaker: The government has indicated that it will be bringing forward something to do with the developers, giving money back to the developers; the Development Charges Act it's called. I would like to have unanimous consent of the House to proceed with the truck safety bill this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: No, there isn't.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In that vein, I'd like to —

Mr Bradley: No, no, right now. Called your bluff.

Hon Mr Sterling: I'm saying a point of order: I'd like to ask unanimous consent of this House to sit past 6 o'clock, till midnight tonight, to consider the truck safety bill. The government caucus is quite willing to do that.

Mr Bradley: You call it right now.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: No. Orders of the day.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We would call for unanimous consent for the government to change the order and call the bill right now.

The Deputy Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr Bradley: There are two House leaders saying you can call the bill right now.

Mr Wildman: You can do it right now.

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps you were not here, but the question has already been asked.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DEVELOPMENT CHARGES ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LES
REDEVANCES D'AMÉNAGEMENT

Mr Hardeman, on behalf of Mr Leach, moved second reading of Bill 98, An Act to promote job creation and increased municipal accountability while providing for the recovery of development costs related to new growth / Projet de loi 98, Loi visant à promouvoir la création d'emplois et à accroître la responsabilité des municipalités

tout en prévoyant le recouvrement des coûts d'aménagement liés à la croissance.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): Surely Palladini wouldn't say he wanted that bill passed and then go on holiday.

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): Mr Speaker —

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Just a minute. Order. The member for Algoma, please. You have the floor, member for Oxford.

Mr Hardeman: When the Development Charges Act, 1996 was introduced our government made it clear to the members of this House that we intended to meet the promises of the Common Sense Revolution. When we were elected, we promised to remove barriers to economic growth; we promised to get rid of obstacles to jobs and investment. This legislation will help us meet those promises.

I'm sure that when the Development Charges Act was introduced in 1989 it was with the best of intentions. It was supposed to provide a framework for the way municipalities recover the cost of services needed for new growth and development. It was supposed to make municipal councils more accountable. It was supposed to ensure that growth actually paid for growth. Make no mistake about it, development charges are necessary. Development charges help to pay for the water and sewer systems and the roads that make new development possible in the first place. Development charges help to pay for the recreation centres, parks and libraries that new residents and new businesses need to thrive and prosper.

But along the way, something went wrong. In the seven years since the act was passed, a fundamental concern has been growing. The Development Charges Act in its present form is encouraging much higher costs than are necessary. Growth is not just paying for growth. Growth is paying for much more than its fair share. High development charges make new homes less affordable for the average Ontario family. That means fewer new homes get built. That kills jobs and opportunity.

Let me give you the example cited by the minister when he introduced the legislation. I don't mind repeating it because it's important and it explains in a nutshell why this government knew it had to take a long, careful look at the Development Charges Act. Today the development charges can account for as much as \$20,000 on the cost of a \$160,000 home in some municipalities in the province. That's 12% of the cost.

High development charges are contributing to the cost of commercial and industrial development too. These charges are cited as one of the major contributing factors as to why construction of new apartment buildings is at a standstill in Ontario. Certainly high development charges are an obstacle to industrial growth. When a business has to hand over \$200,000 in development charges to add 100,000 square feet of industrial space, that business may think twice about expanding in Ontario. That translates into lost jobs and taxes.

For these reasons, in November 1995 we made a commitment to undertake a fundamental review of the Development Charges Act. We wanted to make sure that financing of new infrastructure in Ontario was fair. We made a commitment to reduce the cost of development, to

reduce the cost of constructing new homes and apartment buildings, and we wanted to reduce the cost of industrial expansion. In short, we wanted to make sure that development charges were not a barrier to economic growth.

When we began our review on the act, we asked a lot of questions. We asked whether the development charges should be used to pay for all kinds of new services and facilities. We asked about appropriate standards. We asked whether development charges were fair. We wanted to ensure that these charges were really related to growth. Are new home buyers and new business picking up the entire tab for fancy, new municipal buildings? Is this fair, when everyone else in the community is going to use and enjoy these buildings too? How can we ask young families struggling to buy their first home to pick up the entire bill for a new art gallery?

1530

We didn't ask these questions in isolation. During the past year, we've talked to people from municipalities. We've talked to the development industry and to the home builders. As you might expect, municipalities wanted the Development Charges Act to remain exactly the way it is today, and the developers and home builders thought the government should radically change the act. Home builders and developers called for a drastic reduction in the scope of services which should be eligible for funding through development charges. However, both sides agreed on one thing: Both shared the view that development is extremely important to the economic health of Ontario and that development shouldn't be jeopardized.

The proposed changes we have made to the Development Charges Act will make sure that doesn't happen. This new act, if passed, gives us the balance that works. It meets the needs of the development industry, as it will help to cut the cost of residential, commercial and industrial construction. It will give municipalities the assurance that the key services and infrastructure needed for growth will still be funded through development charges. But most of all, this new act will serve the needs of the people of Ontario. It will make new homes more affordable. It ensures that residents still receive the same neighbourhood services they've grown to expect. The proposed changes in the act will encourage growth in the construction industry and will certainly help to create jobs and promote investment in our community.

We have introduced some crucial and necessary revisions to the Development Charges Act. First, we are proposing that the scope of services eligible for funding through development charges be reduced. We believe that charges should no longer be imposed for facilities like city halls, museums, theatres or tourism facilities. Instead, these facilities should be funded through other municipal revenues. Everyone in the community will enjoy the new museum or the new theatre. Everyone will benefit from the new city hall or new tourist facility. So together, everyone in the community can decide whether they want these facilities and when they want to pay for them.

Second, we are proposing changes that will increase municipal accountability and cost-effectiveness. In the future, municipalities will be asked to make a contribution from general municipal revenues to help cover the costs

of facilities like new libraries and community centres. I think this is an important step, and it's only fair.

Let's stop and think for a moment about what happens when new residents move into their new homes. The day they move in, they pay development charges that go towards new facilities to be built in the future. For example, their development charges may be going towards a new arena. At the same time, new residents immediately begin to pay property taxes that go into general municipal revenues.

For example, their taxes may go to refurbish an old arena already in the community. Now, that old arena may wear out long before the new one does and the property taxes of the new resident will go towards replacing it. In fact, it may happen long before the new arena is even built and it will be years before the general municipal revenues will go towards renewing or replacing that new area. That's a good example of why high development charges can be unfair to new families in the community.

Third, the revised Development Charges Act will require municipal councils to carry out background studies that look at the long-term costs of any new services being considered for funding through development charges. Municipalities will also be asked to calculate the actual benefits coming to the new residents from these services, instead of letting new development and newcomers pay for everything.

Fourth, the new Development Charges Act will promote industrial growth. Under the terms of the new act, any industrial expansion of up to 50% of existing gross floor area will be exempt from development charges.

These measures improve fairness, they enhance accountability, they bring home to everyone the real cost of new services and facilities, and they promote jobs. They will make council decisions more cost-effective and they will make people in the community more cost-aware. That, in turn, will encourage municipalities to contain costs and to deliver services more efficiently.

In the weeks since the 1996 Development Charges Act was introduced, this legislation has received a lot of attention in the media. Some of the comments are pretty farfetched. One TV station reported that if you're going to buy a new house, you will no longer have to pay any development charges, and that's just not so. As I said earlier, growth would still pay for growth and municipalities would still be able to impose development charges to recover the costs of the essential services and infrastructure needed to support that growth.

Another rumour is that the revisions to the act will mean huge property tax increases for Ontario homeowners — millions and millions of dollars, say some municipal leaders. What's my response to those claims? I think it's fair to say that the impact of these revisions can be minimal, provided that municipal leaders think responsibly about what their community can afford, and to what standards. There are other ways to improve the services and not just from the pocketbooks of new residents.

After this legislation was introduced last November, the GTA mayors and regional chairs, along with the development industry, established a committee to review this legislation, and I support that review. The minister has

said time and time again that he is more than willing to consider changes based on sound arguments. If the legislation can be improved, it should be. That's what the legislative process is all about.

I would like to assure municipalities that as a government we're always willing to listen to reasonable concerns and to good, concrete solutions to the problems of high development charges. And it is a problem. According to John Barber of the *Globe and Mail*, development charges in Ontario are probably the highest in North America. It's time we recognized that and began to do something about it.

We all have to realize we live in a new world today. We don't have the money we once had. We certainly recognize that at the provincial level. We all have to realize that we're in a process of change today. That is our only constant. We have to set priorities and make tough choices because we can't keep increasing taxes, and new home buyers and taxpayers can't continue to pick up higher and higher costs.

We believe this legislation is fair and balanced. We believe it would go a long way towards funding growth in a way that's fair to everyone. This new act would give us a balance that's workable. It promises to promote development in this province. It will give Ontario a good balance between what the development industry needs, what municipalities need and what new residents and businesses have a right to expect.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I wish to comment on the member's statement. I was just reading from the Urban Development Institute the effect that various legislation has on the cost of new subdivisions and ultimately on new housing. Let me tell you, Mr Speaker, they are quite different than what we have heard from the minister himself in the past, the account that the honourable member on the other side has mentioned and what we have in the bill itself.

Ultimately, who is going to pay? It's the homeowner, not the developer. At the present time, municipalities are forced to pay half or a large chunk to provide even the hard infrastructure such as roads and sewers and stuff like that. Why should a homeowner be paying for those particular services when a new house, especially for a new house buyer, perhaps is the most difficult and the first expense that they will have to encounter, the most difficult decision that they have to make?

I do concur that certainly there are areas where we can make it easier for a new home buyer to get into that particular first house and get on from there. But the government is not helping one iota with this proposed legislation. So I hope that as we move on with this particular debate on this particular reading, in the time that the government will have to sift through the legislation itself, we'll see some efforts to adjust, amend, change the bill to reflect those inequities and make it so that indeed, whatever savings there may be, they will be passed on to the home buyer ultimately.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): The name of this bill should have been the Friends of the Developer bill or the How to Fill the Tory Campaign Coffers bill, because it does not relate to the needs of municipalities.

At the very time that municipalities are being asked to take on more and more responsibility and more and more costs, at that very time, this government is not allowing the municipalities to be able to charge the appropriate development charges which help them to meet the needs that come about as a result of the new development that takes place in a community. So it is not in isolation to the downloading. In fact, it is a kick in the face after the downloading. If you didn't have the downloading, it would be an imposition upon municipalities, but in this case it's a kick in the face simply because the municipalities have lost revenue sources, those revenue sources being from the provincial government in many cases.

Transfer payments, funding that used to come partially or fully from the provincial government, are now being taken away by the provincial government and yet here you are giving money to the developers. As my colleague the member for Yorkview has mentioned, the theory is that somehow this will be reflected in the price of the house. I suspect it will be reflected in the profit margin rather than in the price of the house, and it makes me very concerned when I see that happening.

Also, I question the priority of this bill. This afternoon we should be dealing with a bill called the flying wheels bill, the truck safety bill, but this government is eager to rush this bill through the House, to get it out into committee. They know it will enhance the coffers of the Progressive Conservative Party, because the developers will be so delighted with this bill that they'll be sending their donations to the Conservative Party. But I'll tell you, the municipalities aren't going to like it very much, and those who wanted to see the truck safety bill this afternoon aren't going to be very happy either.

1540

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): I want to reiterate what my colleague the member for St Catharines has said in response to Bill 98, the Development Charges Act. There has been a great deal of controversy around this bill in any case. One of the issues this government is facing is the fact that it is trying desperately to get dollars out of the public of Ontario without appearing to have its hand in their pockets. The reality is that every single action that's been undertaken by this government in this House with respect to mega-week has all been about getting the dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets by pretending someone else is taking it other than the provincial government.

This bill is not going to change the cost of housing. All this bill is going to do is allow developers to make more profit, and it's going to force municipalities into a situation, as they are with absolutely every item that has been downloaded on to them by this government, of raising user fees, of raising taxes, of raising every kind of charge they can to try and make up for the over \$1 billion which is the slide between what this government says it has taken away from the costs of the municipalities by removing the education tax.

This government constantly pooh-poohs the very clear figures that are coming forward from virtually every municipality, saying how much they will lose in terms of their ability to provide services to the citizens of their area. This bill, Bill 98, is just another example of that, so

paint it as they will, this government is simply trying to use this bill as another means of extracting dollars from the public of Ontario.

Mr Jim Flaherty (Durham Centre): I'm pleased to have an opportunity to compliment my colleague the member for Oxford for his analysis of this important piece of legislation and for the work he's done on the legislation in his capacity as the parliamentary assistant for municipal affairs.

This is important legislation for young families, and this is the key part of the legislation because what has been happening, unfortunately, in this great province of Ontario is that some municipalities have been using development charges to pay for all manner of facilities in the communities, at the expense of young families buying homes. This is at the time in their lives when they have the least resources, where it's difficult to get the money together, as they know, for a down payment to get that first home, to get that stake in the real estate market.

I know my friends opposite don't agree with supporting young families in buying homes, but why should young families buying homes be paying, as they have been, and which this bill will correct, for cultural centres for the whole community, be paying for tourism facilities for the whole community, be paying for land for parks for the whole community, be paying for hospitals for the entire community, be paying for the provision of headquarters for the general administration of the municipality, and these other matters, all of which benefit all of the people who live in the community?

This is important legislation that is long overdue and it benefits those young families with children who are the future of this province in our communities, particularly in areas like Whitby and north Oshawa, where we have significant growth, where these young families are struggling to get the down payments and make our Ontario more prosperous.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Oxford, you have two minutes.

Mr Hardeman: I'd like to thank the members for Yorkview, St Catharines, London Centre and Durham Centre for their comments.

The major concern that came out was first of all the issue of whether taking some of the items off the eligibility list on development charges and lowering development charges on new homes would reduce the cost of a new home. I'm sure everyone will realize that when the development charges were put on new homes, the developer obviously passed through the cost of development charges. I think that was a reasonable assumption.

I have every reason to believe that in a competitive market, as the cost of building a new home goes down, the competitive situation in the housing market will also reduce the cost of a new home for first-time home buyers, in fact for any new home buyers.

It's also very important to remember that the Development Charges Act came into place to replace what were formerly the lot levies, where municipalities could charge whatever they felt appropriate on the cost of a new house for the services they were providing. The Development Charges Act was put in place so municipalities had to justify those costs.

The present act allows all those charges to be added on, such as the museums and the art galleries, which first-time home buyers are maybe not in the position to pay their share of at the present time. We feel that lowering the cost of the new home by that amount would assist those first-time home buyers and make new home affordability available to far more people in the province and, furthermore, create jobs for people who are going to build those new homes and help our economy.

Mr Bradley: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask for unanimous consent for the member for Durham Centre to be able to name the municipalities that were abusing this.

The Deputy Speaker: Unanimous consent? No. Further debate.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): First of all, Mr Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to split the 90-minute leadoff time with my Liberal colleague the member for Yorkview.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there consent? Agreed.

Mr Gerretsen: Thank you very much. I thought the last exchange with the member for Durham Centre was kind of interesting. When he was asked to name the particular communities that are abusing this, he was not prepared to name any of them. That's kind of interesting. There are these generalizations made that the current act has been abused by municipalities, yet there seem to be very few examples. I'll be reading from some material later on which clearly indicates that all the activity under the former act really hasn't had that great an effect at all on the development industry and on the development of this province. I will be dealing with that information, from non-partisan organizations that don't have a specific interest in this one way or another.

The first comment I would like to make deals with the whole notion of this bill even being here currently. We've got a dramatic situation that exists in the province right now where many people who drive along our highways on a day-to-day basis, particularly along the 400-series highways, are extremely concerned about the number of trucks on these highways and the number of wheels that are flying off these trucks. I know I'm concerned about that whenever I drive in from my home community of Kingston or drive back to it at the end of the week: "Is this going to be the truck from which a flying wheel is going to appear and do some damage not only to me but to other people as well?" That's a concern.

It's absolutely beyond me why we should not be debating a bill that deals with that truck safety matter when we know the Minister of Transportation, the Honourable Al Palladini, is very concerned about this bill —
1550

Mr Flaherty: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The bill being debated is Bill 98, development charges. The opposition has refused to sit till midnight so we cannot deal with the other bill he would like to debate. But we can do that till midnight.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you for helping me in my functions. It will take a little while for him to start his preamble. I know that he's going to warm up and he will refer to the bill. I'm sure you will, won't you? The member for Kingston and The Islands.

Mr Gerretsen: I have 30 pages of notes here referring to this bill and to what this government has been doing to this province over the last couple of years.

I was just referring to the fact that if the Minister of Transportation feels that the truck safety matter is an extremely important matter, why didn't the government introduce that bill first? Why am I saying that? I'm saying that because this bill, if it is so important, had first reading in this House on November 25, more than three months ago — and we have sat just about every day since then, except for a very brief, short Christmas holiday period of time — if this bill is so important, why wasn't it called in December when we sat until midnight for a good two weeks? It was during that time that we were advised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that this bill wasn't a high priority any more within the government.

I would say to him, if it wasn't a high priority, then why is it a high priority now when obviously the truck safety matter, in which all of the three parties have a tremendous interest, is a matter that should be before us now? That's the first point I'd like to make just as a preamble.

Second, it deals with the whole manner in which the government deals with municipal government in this province. I know the government loves to talk about partnerships, that they have formed a new partnership with municipalities. It's an equal partnership and the government is going to do its thing and allow municipalities to do their thing, which is to run their own municipalities.

First let me say that there's absolutely nothing new about that. Those of us who have been around for a while, whether in this forum or at the municipal level, know that we've heard that kind of talk for at least the last 30 or 40 years. Every government has talked about partnership, yet every government has done the same thing. Whenever it suits its own purposes, it will bring in a piece of legislation and then all of a sudden the partnership be darned.

I can't for the life of me understand, if you really have an equal partnership here with the municipalities, why you would feel it necessary to bring in this kind of legislation. Why would you not allow municipalities to make their own arrangements with the development industry? It has worked, by and large, to a large extent in this province on an ongoing basis. I think that most developers as well would think that most municipalities are more than reasonable in their demands.

It's certainly something that I think this government is very lax in. At times they proclaim partnership whenever they want to download something on the municipalities, for example, then they talk about partnerships; but at other times when it suits their purposes, then they say, "This is an area where I guess we can't trust municipalities and where we have to step in."

Another bill that comes to mind and that really brings that to the foreground, a bill that we are currently debating in this House, is the water and sewer bill. About 25% of all the water and sewer facilities in this province are currently owned by the province, mainly older plants — they are plants that were built in communities that could never have afforded to build those plants with their own financial resources — and the province is now saying in

that bill, Bill 107: "Here, you take it over, it's your responsibility. From now you will have to pay all the costs that are associated with it. You'll have to pay the capital debentures that may still be outstanding. Whether or not you can afford it, that's it." If it's such a wonderful idea, as I've said before in this House, why don't we leave it up to each municipality to decide, in a true partnership arrangement, whether they want to take on that responsibility? And there are other bills as well.

We have grave concern about the impact of this bill on municipalities. We have to look at it in the context of all the other government announcements that have been made during the last month that have dumped other financial responsibilities in a number of different areas on to municipalities. Municipality after municipality is already saying that what you have done to them in the last couple of months, by dumping all the social welfare and housing and health requirements on them, is going to cost local taxpayers, through their property taxes, more and more money.

Here we have an act that is going to prevent municipalities, even in their relationship with new development, from charging for those things that they in their elected wisdom think is best in their particular case. We have grave concern about that.

We think all these pieces of legislation are very much connected. Bill 98 can't be considered in isolation from this downloading of long-term care for seniors, welfare, public health services, child care, libraries, public housing, public transportation and highways. Those changes will hurt municipalities, and the bottom line is that the property taxpayers will face a cost of more than \$1 billion.

You may be interested in knowing that just today an interim report was released by the community impact review committee, which was set up by our own caucus, on which different members from our caucus, under the chairmanship of Gerry Phillips, travelled around the province to find out the impacts of some of this downloading on the local taxpayer. They found that municipality after municipality is having tremendous difficulties with it and so are social agencies.

We should look at the actual figures of the downloading on to local municipalities. I know the government would like to take credit for the fact that it is taking \$5.4 billion off the property tax roll through the removal of the education tax, but — and I think we should go through this list again — these are the costs being added on to the property tax system in Ontario at a cost of \$6.3 billion, which is \$1 billion more than what's being taken off.

In community policing, for example, \$180 million is being added on. In the farm tax rebate system, \$165 million is being added on to the property tax rolls. In the assessment services, which are going to be downloaded on to local municipalities, \$120 million is being added on. In social housing, the operating costs alone for the social housing that exists in the province will all be downloaded on to local municipalities at a cost of \$890 million.

Municipal transit and the GO service will add another \$395 million. Libraries — we'll be discussing the library bills tomorrow; I notice the minister is in the House today — is another downloading on to municipalities of \$20 million that in effect will do away with the free use

of libraries at the local level. In public health \$225 million is being added on. Ambulance services, which have never been a municipal responsibility, are going to add \$200 million to the local taxpayers. Special care homes are going to add on \$25 million.

The ferry subsidies: I've talked so much about this in this House because it affects three systems within my own riding and three communities whose lifeline to the rest of the province is literally at stake as a result of this downloading of \$15 million. Fire, sewer and water: \$10 million. In social assistance alone the amount of \$2.6 billion is being downloaded on the local municipalities; child care \$270 million; long-term care \$1.1 billion.

There is an offset of \$65 million in provincial offences, because the revenues will be going into the local municipalities, even though that figure of \$65 million, I might say, is totally at variance with the figure Crombie came up with in his report. He figured it was only \$30 million.

To put it all into perspective, \$5.4 billion is being taken off the property tax roll but \$6.3 billion is being added on, for an average cost in Ontario of \$540 per household. What is the relationship of all of this to Bill 98? There's a direct relationship, because in Bill 98 you are not allowing municipalities to make their own arrangements with the developers as they come by and want to develop a parcel of land.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why you wouldn't do that. You are totally denying the fact that when a new subdivision is being built, those individuals are going to enjoy some of the municipal services that are already out there. To suggest that somehow this is going to make the price of housing cheaper in the province simply is not the case.

1600

Even your own commission, the Crombie committee, was dead set against this recommendation. They do not believe there should have been any changes. Let me just quote, if I can find it here, exactly what Mr Crombie said about this. What did he say again? Well, it's in here somewhere, and I will get to it sooner or later. I know you will wait.

The people of Ontario have to understand that all of these bills we have been discussing here over the last two or three months, as they relate to their local municipalities, are interrelated. They are interrelated to the extent that the government of Ontario has taken over those areas where funding is stable and easy to control. It will be easier to control in the matter of education for the simple reason that statistics will show you that the school-age population within our society over the next 15 years will increase at a much diminished rate compared to the senior citizen population of this province. In other words, the demand for social and health care services that are now downloaded to the local municipalities is going to increase at a much greater rate than the demand for extra funding in the school system.

You've been very smart. I've got to give you credit for that. You have somehow conned the people of Ontario into thinking that it's a good deal for them. I know when I was involved in the municipal field I always got complaints too about how much the education portion was of the property tax bill. In some municipalities, it's over

50%, 60% or 70%. Many people said, "If we could only take those costs off, the property taxes would go down." I, in my own naïve manner, always used to think, "Yes, okay, if we take the property taxes off and if we have the municipalities pay for those hard-core services that municipal governments are involved with on a day-to-day basis, then property taxes will go down."

But I don't think that anybody ever thought or could conceive of a situation where the province would actually take health care costs, ambulance costs, social assistance or long-term-care costs and dump them on to municipalities.

Hon Marilyn Mushinski (Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation): It has already been done.

Mr Gerretsen: The minister says it's already being done now. But you know as well as I do, Minister, that it's being done at a much lower percentage rate right now. There is a huge difference between allowing municipalities to pay 20% of these costs and 50% of these costs or, in some cases, 100% of the costs, as you are saying in the matter of ambulance services to the local municipality.

This is all truly related. These are all bills that are going to make the Mike Harris government look good in that you can go ahead with your tax cut, with which of course none of us on this side agree; all of us believe you would be much better off trying to get the deficit down to zero, and then maybe we could talk about some tax relief to the people of Ontario. But to start giving money back before an individual budget in any given year is down to a zero base deficit is absolute nonsense.

According to your own figures, you the taxfighters, you the people who are fighting against the deficit and the public debt of this province, the public debt of this province is going from \$100 billion last year to \$120 billion in the year 1999. It just so happens that the extra \$20 billion that it's going to increase by is going to be the amount of the accumulated tax cut you're giving to the people of the province of Ontario, 90% of which will end up in the pockets of people who are making \$100,000 or more.

The bottom line is this: If you make a lot of money, then you're going to get a good tax cut. Your property taxes are going up. But if you are Mr and Mrs Average Ontario, the amount of extra money you'll find in your pocket from your paycheque may go up by \$5, \$10 or \$15 a week, but you will end up paying, according to the Treasurer of Ontario's own figures, at least an additional \$540, on average, in property taxes throughout the province of Ontario. That is even before taking into account the effects of Bill 98, because Bill 98, Mr Speaker, as you and I well know, is one of those bills that really doesn't matter much to anybody right now, except if you're a developer, when it's undoubtedly going to benefit you, or if you're a municipality, when it's undoubtedly going to affect the way you can negotiate with a developer. Nobody else is really affected until they actually buy that house or they actually find out that some of the services that used to be paid for in development charges can no longer be done, so municipalities will now have to take other money to do some of the things they can now no longer charge for.

I like the way the member for Oxford said, "You know, we now are going to rely on the local councils to make up the difference of money that they can no longer get from the developers in these various categories; We're going to rely on their good judgement," as if to say that before Bill 98 the amounts of money that were collected in development charges were somehow mismanaged or misused by the local councils, which is something I totally reject. You can't have it both ways. You can't say: "Once we pass our legislation, councils will become very responsible. We know they won't be able to collect as much any more, but we also know they're not going to spend it foolishly." That is saying, by reverse, that when they were able to collect it beforehand, they somehow wasted the money, and this is something I totally reject.

All these tactics are sort of typical Mike Harris tactics of divide and conquer, because now, in the future, municipalities will have to choose between the demands of the homeowners to keep the property taxes low — and I know every municipal councillor out there is burdened by that and certainly wants to do that — and the needs of the poor, the sick and the elderly. Those are going to be the choices that are left after a lot of the social and health care services have been downloaded on to local municipalities.

It is my hope that the government will realize that this is going to lead to very serious urban decay and a real sense of conflict between the property taxpayers of this province and those whose very lives depend on these programs. This mistake, I believe, must be fixed.

It's interesting that even Mike Harris's own friends, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, have called this a shell game. They've called it a shell game, your friends — you used to quote them in the House here all the time — because what you're going to lose through the tax cut you're going to make up in property taxes.

No one likes the status quo, but what is being proposed here in this series of legislation of which Bill 98 is an intricate part is worse than the status quo. It seems that the Tories are much more interested in getting things done fast than in getting them done right. The government is proceeding with dumping new cost responsibilities on to municipalities when they admit they don't yet know the real cost of transferring the highways, of paying for the social housing, of fixing dilapidated sewers and water facilities or of implementing new agencies to administer the long-term care.

It's kind of interesting. In all those three cases, which are three different aspects of municipal life, all we have focused on in this House so far are the ongoing operating costs on a day-to-day basis. We haven't even started to address where the capital costs will come from in order to rebuild those homes for the aged, in which the province used to play a major role. Who's going to pay that somewhere down the line, five or 10 years, when major retrofits are needed? Is the province going to come up with its share at that point in time?

The same thing applies with respect to the sewer and water facilities I talked about earlier. These are facilities that were built in the 1950s and 1960s under the enlightened Conservative governments of John Robarts and Bill Davis, and I'm sure the people who were

involved in those days must be saying to themselves now, "My gosh, what has happened to my party?" There's no longer this consensus-building; there is just a transferring down to municipalities and, "Let them figure it out themselves," but only in those areas where they want to because, as we've seen in Bill 98, there they are going to restrict the municipalities to a much greater extent.

1610

The government has announced a number of extremely significant changes with the Who Does What legislation, and the first massive change to the way that property taxes are raised includes the elimination of the \$1.6-billion business occupancy tax, as Bill 106 has implemented. The \$1.6 billion will be added on to residential, commercial and industrial property tax, along with the huge tax shifts between properties.

Second, the Who Does What recommendations talked about the effective elimination of school boards as they manage the school system, as the province takes over the financial responsibility and sets every school board budget in the province.

I was just trying to give you a general overview as to how this bill fits in, and I will now get to the specifics of the bill. I'm just sort of going along here.

Let me give you a couple of examples, and these are from municipalities. The member wasn't prepared to name the municipalities he regarded as having abused the system, and I'm not for a moment saying that these municipalities abuse the system, but I am going to give you some figures, according to their own departments, on how this new bill is going to affect them.

We heard about Mississauga before. Mississauga, if Bill 98 passes, will lose about \$60 million in capital funding for new services over the next 10 years. I would like the members from Mississauga, and I know we've got four or five of them here, to address that issue.

Interjection.

Mr Gerretsen: The member says, "What's another \$60 million?" Is that your attitude? Well, thank you very much. To him it doesn't matter, but I'll tell you, if you're a municipal councillor who has relied on this money in order to put the infrastructure in your community, then it certainly will matter. Obviously he doesn't have that experience and obviously he's a high roller, because \$60 million he just sort of waves off with his hand like that.

Richmond Hill: \$69 million. It is contemplating a 21.1% increase in property taxes to help pay for the new growth. Ajax: \$6 million over five years.

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton North): The city hall in Kingston.

Mr Gerretsen: No, the city hall in Kingston — my friend there talks about the city hall in Kingston, and I could give you a whole dissertation about the city hall in Kingston. It was built in 1842, I will have you know, and it is still one of the buildings that we in eastern Ontario are extremely proud of because it was built during that very short period of time when Kingston was indeed the capital of Canada. It doesn't need money for this. As a matter of fact, in my community we don't have any development charges, and there are other communities as well, because basically we have worked it out with our development industries as to what kind of charges are to

be made. We don't have any charges like this. We all know these charges are required much more for the new growth communities.

Mr Spina: A credit to you as the mayor.

Mr Gerretsen: Thank you very much, sir.

Then we have Burlington. They stand to lose \$17.3 million over 10 years. As a matter of fact, the last issue of *Municipal World*, with which I'm sure the parliamentary assistant is well familiar, the issue of January 1997, gives a whole chart as to how the changes in the development charges will impact different municipalities. It is very interesting. You get places like Brampton, for example. They expect a mill rate increase — and this is not a partisan document made up by my party or by some other; these figures come from the treasurers of the local municipalities. This comes from a non-partisan publication. This is not some sort of partisan document that may be highly suspect because it is being used for perhaps not the purposes for which it was intended.

In any event, this document shows that in Brampton they expect a 24.1% increase in the mill rate as a result of the contemplated changes in Bill 98; Aurora, 14.55% increase; East Gwillimbury, 15.22%; Georgina in York region, 13.6%; Markham, a 28.18% increase in the local tax rate. So those are the kinds of tax increases that people can expect as a result of the contemplated changes in Bill 98, which is going to demand a lot less money, in effect, from the developers when they want to develop a parcel of land. Richmond Hill, as I stated before, 21.1%; Vaughan, 13.2%. And yes, there are some municipalities that are hardly affected at all because they are more developed communities that don't require the kind of funding mechanisms in order to fund a lot of the infrastructure that's already there, where it's going to be a lot less.

It's kind of interesting how the GTA mayors and the regional chairs came up with some principles that have to be followed, that in their opinion should be followed, in considering new development charges legislation. I think it would be well for the parliamentary assistant to take these principles into account and to compare these principles to the principles that you used in your department in order to come up with the bill we've got before us. These principles are as follows:

"(1) New growth must continue to pay for itself." Okay?

"(2) Municipalities should have the right to establish, but be required to defend, reasonable, sustainable and cost-effective levels of service and to set the appropriate development charges to pay for those services."

The parliamentary assistant is nodding yes, that they're doing this, but you're not. You're not allowing that opportunity for municipalities. You are saying in your bill precisely what they can or cannot charge for, and it may very well be, Mr Parliamentary Assistant, that in a situation that you haven't even contemplated there may be situations where a particular charge is highly appropriate and called for that your legislation does not allow municipalities to implement. Why, if you are such a great believer and strong believer in forming a lasting, equal partnership with municipalities, do you even find it

necessary to bring in this legislation? That's the question I would like you to answer.

The third principle that the group came up with was as follows: "(3) Development charges should be based on reasonably anticipated future levels of services and expenditures as determined by appropriate underlying studies."

I would like to know what kind of studies the province has in this particular case that these changes are necessary, because as I will be telling you later on, Mr Speaker, the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, as far as they are concerned, have come to the conclusion that really the old law hasn't affected development one way or another and that it has not been a detriment to the development industry in this province at all.

"(4) Development charge practices inconsistent with the spirit of the legislation are not supported by municipalities and should be dealt with accordingly.

"(5) Development charge legislation must achieve a high degree of administrative simplicity which is not apparent in the new legislation."

If there's one thing that I'm a strong believer in, it's to make these things as simple as possible, and the less administration you have in it, the better it is. But here is a group of municipalities that have dealt with this legislation, that have looked at it, and they've come to the conclusion, and I'll read it again, that "Development charge legislation must achieve a high degree of administrative simplicity which is not apparent in the new legislation." Here's this independent group that has said, "Look, you may have thought what you were doing made good administrative sense, but you're not simplifying it administratively at all." I think they ought to be listened to and ought to be given an awful lot of credence. These are the people who on a day-to-day basis administer the development charges legislation in this province.

1620
"(6) Permissive legislation should enable municipalities to grant exemptions to development charges rather than legislating exemptions."

That's the whole point, isn't it? If a municipality finds, because of its particular development pressures in its situation, that it is really doing both the development industry and the future home buyer a major disservice by charging for items that are no longer required, or make it burdensome on any group that may be involved with the legislation or be affected by it, the municipality should be able to exempt that. It shouldn't require the province to exempt that. They shouldn't prejudice the issue beforehand, which is exactly what they're doing by enacting this kind of legislation.

"(7) There should be an attempt to ensure equity amongst taxpayers so that those who have had to bear the growth-related costs in the past are not now having to cross-subsidize further new growth."

That really is the essence of the whole situation. My friends will say, "They shouldn't have to pay for a city hall, they shouldn't have to pay for a new museum, and the other exemptions as well." Well, these people are going to enjoy the benefits of them. Why shouldn't they be forced to pay, through the development charges, some of these costs? Why shouldn't they? This seventh prin-

ciple clearly goes to that principle that anyone who benefits from having the services there should in effect pay towards them.

"(8) Any savings that accrue as a result of reductions in development charges should be passed on to end users." And the end users, of course, are the taxpayers.

"(9) Municipalities are willing to review the issue of service standards and how best to address any concerns together with the province and the development industry."

That obviously is not happening here because the province basically has decided that its friends, the developer industry, as a result of a very effective lobby — I've got to give them credit for that — have been able to push forward at this time a piece of legislation that the province itself, last December or November, didn't think was of the utmost urgency.

We all know there's much more urgent legislation required now in a number of different areas. One area we talked about earlier is the whole area of truck safety. This is a priority of all three parties. I think all of us are concerned about the wheels flying off trucks as we go along the highway, and why the government isn't bringing that legislation forward at this point in time is beyond us.

Mr Flaherty: Why won't you sit to midnight? Too lazy?

Mr Gerretsen: No, I'm not lazy at all, sir, but you have to get your priorities straight. Why is this matter such a great priority at this point —

The Deputy Speaker: Order. To the member for Durham Centre, those are words that can attract ire. You've got to be careful you don't use that type of word. It's not unparliamentary but it's offensive. I would find it offensive if you would tell me. I hope you understand.

Mr Gerretsen: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I almost choked on the member's words, but I'll get through it.

I talked earlier about the Crombie recommendations, and I have found them now. I think we should review this because here we're talking about an individual, David Crombie, who was not only an excellent mayor of the city of Toronto, so I understand — he certainly has that reputation outside — he was a cabinet minister. He was instructed by and engaged by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to construct this Who Does What panel to look at the various acts that are out there and to make certain recommendations.

What did that commission say about the Development Charges Act as proposed by the government? This comes from a letter he wrote to the minister on November 8. He states:

"The subpanel believes that the range of services and associated capital costs that can be included under the act are reasonable and fair." Those are the existing costs he's talking about and the existing services. "It recognizes that a number of technical administrative amendments are required to improve the operational aspects of the act. Furthermore, current legislation provides a satisfactory process to ensure that the development charges policy is applied in a fair and open fashion."

In other words, there's already a process in place to make sure the developers aren't gouged, the municipalities aren't gouged and the homeowners aren't gouged. This

process applies for public meetings as well as appeals to the OMB. The subpanel further goes on and states:

"Development charges are a critical and essential municipal revenue source for financing growth-related capital infrastructure. Any amendments to the act to reduce the scope or permitted level of development charges will mean higher municipal taxes or user fees. It is also noted that the permissive nature of the act does not obligate municipalities to impose a development charge." That goes back to the earlier comment I made, that there are many municipalities that simply don't have these charges. "For these reasons, the subpanel strongly recommends" — I'd like the parliamentary assistant to take note of this — "that municipalities should continue to decide on the level of development charges in accordance with the act."

Why don't you leave it to the municipalities? I know I'm starting to sound like a broken record on that, but it is an absolute fact that if you really believe in partnership with municipalities, if you really want to give municipalities the full power and control over their own destiny, allow them to decide it themselves, and I'm very pleased to say that the Crombie commission, the government's own commission, totally agrees with our position on that.

Clearly the government is cherry-picking the recommendations of the Crombie commission instead of implementing them as a coordinated policy. The government doesn't agree with Crombie's recommendations on development charges, so it ignores them. Other recommendations that help it transfer funding get the government's rubber stamp of approval.

As with other actions the government has taken, the result has been chaos, conflict and instability, and we can certainly all attest to the instability aspect of it. In the hearings that we held around the province — we went to about five or six municipalities; this is our own caucus group, and I quoted from that report earlier — we spoke to 300 to 400 groups in about 10 different municipalities. If one message came over loud and clear again and again it was the message that a lot of these organizations simply don't know what the funding sources are going to be, simply don't know how much they're going to receive, simply don't know how much taxes are going to go up.

This is really disconcerting to a lot of people, because people want to know out there. I know the average taxpayer will say, "Maybe this is just an argument between the government and the opposition and the municipalities, and who do we believe?" I can understand people taking that position. You're getting so much information, it's almost like information overload. Who are you to believe? Today we have megacity elections here in Toronto. Who is to be believed? Should it be yes? Should it be no? Is the downloading really happening?

I can tell you that as far as the local municipalities that have taken a look at all the legislation are concerned — I'm not talking about the political bodies; I'm talking about the clerks and treasurers, I'm talking about the CAOs at the different municipalities — they've come up with figures as to what all this downloading means, and this is even before the implications of Bill 98 are taken into account: the city of Kingston, \$28 million more on the property tax roll as a result of downloading; Brantford,

\$32 million more; the city of London, \$57 million or more; you go to the region of Ottawa-Carleton, \$120 million to \$160 million.

I know a lot of people will say: "What do those figures mean? Why don't you translate it into something that's manageable?" I know that in my community it means that property taxes are going to increase by \$540, on the average, per household. In other words, whatever somebody's taxes are now, with all the current programs that the government wants to implement and if we don't have any changes in them whatsoever as far as taking programs away or adding new programs on etc is concerned, the people are going to be paying, on the average, \$540 more next year than they are this year, and that is wrong. That is the bottom line. That is the kind of figure I think the average person can relate to.

Getting back specifically to this bill, I've already given you the statistics on Vaughan, Oakville and Burlington, which are some of the other municipalities. Those are the municipalities that have halted or restricted development in some way. Yes, this was interesting. There were a number of municipalities that in effect said: "Look, we don't know what is going to happen. We are going to freeze all development until we know what act actually applies." I think that's probably hurting development more than anything else.

1630

It should come as no surprise to the government that municipalities are diametrically opposed to this legislation, as are the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers. It is very interesting, and I will just quickly refer to what the municipal clerks and treasurers had to say about this because these people have taken a look at the whole act. They've done a very detailed study. They've looked at what they could charge under the current legislation and what it will be under the new legislation, and this is the conclusion they come to. It also addresses the earlier point about how the current act has really affected development in Ontario.

Let me just read you a rather lengthy paragraph. I'll take it section by section, but it'll give you some idea as to what the clerks and treasurers of Ontario think. They believe "that municipalities have utilized the authority provided under the current act in a responsible manner." They believe "that the charges imposed by municipalities have not had a significant impact on the quantity of housing construction or the cost of housing to the consumer. These aspects of the housing sector were affected by other market forces which determine housing prices and market size and which render development charges inconsequential in affecting housing costs and housing supply. In addition, a report prepared in May 1996 by Metro planning, with funding support from the office for the greater Toronto area and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, entitled *Towards an Industrial Land Strategy*, found that 'Since development charges are a one-time charge they have little impact on the decision-making of many industrial tenants.'"

Isn't that interesting? Remember, one of the major pieces of this legislation is the fact that if an expansion takes place of 50% or less of the existing industrial

plans — it's expanded by 50% or less — you can't charge any development charges. That is a tremendous loss to the municipalities. But let's just read again; let me just tell you once again what this study that was partly funded by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing said. It said:

"Since development charges are a one-time charge they have little impact on the decision-making of many industrial tenants.' In fact, many municipalities have chosen to impose only a percentage of the development charge," which gets back to the earlier comments made by the parliamentary assistant. He makes it sound as if all of these municipalities, under the existing legislation, have been gouging the development industry. This independent report clearly states that many municipalities have chosen to impose only a percentage of the development charge or no development charges at all, as I indicated earlier.

"While the current act provides some flexibility to do so while not limiting the ability of the municipality to address unique situations, Bill 98" — the bill that we're dealing with here today, according to the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, according to a study that was partly funded by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing — "reduces municipal flexibility to finance growth-related service requirements and, in a number of situations, will impose additional costs on the citizens of municipalities to the benefit of the development industry."

There you have it in black and white, not from a political party, not from a poor anti-development part of the industry, but from an independent group that clearly states, and I'll read it once again, "Bill 98 reduces municipal flexibility to finance growth-related service requirements and, in a number of situations, will impose additional costs on the citizens of municipalities to the benefit of the development industry." I ask you, is that right?

"Furthermore," it goes on to say, "there is no mechanism to force developers to pass on the savings from development charges to home buyers and the development industry has given no indication of an intention to do so. As a consequence, there is little likelihood that Bill 98 will result in lower prices for new housing."

Mr Parliamentary Assistant, you answer that question, you answer it at the appropriate time, "As a consequence, there is little likelihood that Bill 98 will result in lower prices for new housing." So who is Bill 98 going to benefit? There's only one group of people, and those are the developers.

Interjection.

Mr Gerretsen: Look, this isn't my document; this is an independent study that was done that was partly funded by your ministry and it has come to that conclusion. These are the clerks and treasurers that each municipality relies on for all the best kind of information of a financial nature that they require.

Certainly, to my way of thinking, if there's any doubt at all by the general public in Ontario as to what this legislation is all about, it's about only one thing, and that is there's absolutely no guarantee that the price of housing will go down, there's no guarantee that the so-called cost saving will be passed on to the consumers. But there will definitely be a guarantee that in effect those municipalities

that have development charges will be collecting less money and will have to increase their taxes, as we've already heard from Richmond Hill, from Markham, from various other places, where the taxes could rise anywhere from 5% to 25%.

Again I say to the government, what's the hurry with this legislation? Why bring this forward at this point of time? You gave it first reading in November of last year. This truck safety legislation is something that all three parties are extremely interested in, and forget about the three parties, that the public in Ontario is extremely interested in.

People who are driving, particularly the 400-series highways, are concerned on an ongoing basis when they're passing another group of trucks, "Is it going to happen to me this time?" It's almost like being involved with the lottery except it's on the downside: "Is a flying wheel going to hit my car?" I'll tell you, it's a concern that I have, and I know many other people have as well, as you drive along the highways.

That's the kind of legislation we should be debating here, not legislation that the government, for whatever reason, didn't feel it was necessary to reintroduce or to bring forward for second reading over a four-month period of time. We all know that at the end of this week we're going on a break for a short period of time, so if there is any urgent legislation, this would have been the time to bring it in.

The other thing is that the government tries to justify this bill by citing the example of a \$20,000 lot levy on a \$140,000 home, for a total new cost to the homeowner of \$160,000. Let me first of all say it's my understanding that the locations where lot levies have been more than \$10,000 are confined strictly to the GTA, and since lot levies are tied to the value of the home, fees of over \$10,000 are usually found only on homes costing more than \$200,000. Al Leach's \$20,000 lot levy that he talked about on a \$140,000 home is not only highly abnormal but it must be treated with great suspicion, unless he is actually willing to document it here. I know the statement has been made, but to the best of my recollection he has never actually indicated just where these houses are for \$140,000 that have a \$20,000 lot levy on top of it.

Before turning it over to my colleague from Yorkview, there's just one other point I want to make. This was as a result of a presentation that was made to us, and it wasn't directly in relation to this bill but it was in relation to a related bill, Bill 20. It was made by C.N. Watson and Associates. This is an organization that I must admit I was familiar with by name only. It's a firm of consulting economists that works for municipalities, works for school boards, works for interest groups etc. They did their own independent analysis of Bill 20, which I know is the Planning Act, but also of the development charges component of it that is now reflected in this bill.

It's very interesting to see the conclusions that they came up with. Just from reading their brief, they have at one time acted for both developers and municipalities. They've been on all sides of the fence. I'll just read you some of this, because I think it's very interesting. It comes from a firm that obviously deals an awful lot with these kinds of development situations, but from all different angles.

It states in that report, "Based on the ministry releases and speeches, we understand that the primary purpose is to remove an obstacle to growth and to development which would be created by future increases in development charges." It goes on to say that the underlying assumption is presumably that development charges are already unduly high and are being increased substantially in some cases. It is assumed that they would continue to increase at an unreasonable rate in the absence of, in that case, the Bill 20 controls. Also this legislation prevents development charges being used as an alternate capital funding source to compensate for subsidy declines.

1640

The comment they come up with is — and they have looked at about 54 different municipalities — "Based on our research, and with a limited number of exceptions, the answer to this question is no." That is the question of whether or not development charges have been increasing significantly in recent years. During the past four years, the vast majority of development charges, in 91% of these municipal situations, have either declined or have remained unchanged in real terms after you adjust for inflation.

What's interesting about this is that it does away with the whole notion that somehow development charges are to blame for the lack of growth within the development industry or the lack of development at all. According to what they have studied, of 51 actual municipalities in the province of Ontario, in 91% of them, more than nine out of 10, the development charges either declined or have remained unchanged, and they have had little effect on whether or not the development charges have been increasing. That's the argument the government always likes to bring forward as the reason this kind of legislation is necessary.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to wind up my portion of it and turn it over to my colleague by once again reminding you and the members here and the people of Ontario that what we are really talking about here is all part of a giant scheme by Mike Harris to basically take over costs that are going to be much more predictable in the future, such as education costs, because we all know that the school-age population of this province is going to rise at a much lower rate than the senior-citizen population and those people who will require the social services, health care services, long-term-care services and social housing services of this province, because that's going to rise at a much greater rate. He's taking over sure costs over highly volatile and unpredictable costs.

In the climate where that's going to take place, about which there's already much confusion in this province, because municipalities really don't know whether they're coming or going as far as what the cost implications are going to be, to add on this new Bill 98, which is in effect going to limit the municipality's ability to deal with its developers in a fair and equitable fashion, as has been the case, as has been indicated by the independent studies, to my way of thinking is making it much tougher on municipalities once again and it's certainly not helping them. If it's helping them, then why aren't they in favour? Why isn't AMO in favour? Why isn't the AMCTO, the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, in favour if it's all such a good deal?

I say to this government, take this bill back. Take it back. Do what you said you'd promise to do at AMO conference after AMO conference, when the minister stands in front of the delegates and says, "I want to be in partnership with you." Make it a truly equal partnership situation by allowing the municipality to charge those development charges that it can negotiate with its own developers in its own particular situation. Do not impose this kind of legislation on municipalities. They are going to have it tough enough in the years to come with the other downloading legislation. With that, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague from Yorkview.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: For some time there has not been a quorum in the House, and before the member begins to speak I think it would be appropriate to call a quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Ms Marilyn Churley): Is there a quorum?

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex D. McFedries): A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. Further debate?

Mr Sergio: I am pleased to add to the debate on this important piece of legislation which the government has introduced at this particular time.

Before I get into the discussion and the debate, I would like to congratulate my colleague the member for Kingston and The Islands on his extremely in-depth presentation. Let me repeat what he said at the beginning: What was the urgency to introduce this bill now, Bill 98, which deals with the development charges, when we have some other much more pressing, much more important legislation that I think the government should have introduced to the House and dealt with? I am speaking of the transportation, highway, whatever you wish to call it — I call it the flying wheel bill. It is the law that the minister has introduced himself and he said, "I hope I get the opposition's support." We have said, "Let's do it now," because we understand the importance of that legislation.

Of course, the government in its wisdom has decided to introduce Bill 98 and we will have to wait for the much more important and much more urgent bill which is something that saves lives on a daily basis. With all the good intentions of the government and the Minister of Transportation, wheels are still flying and people's lives are in peril every hour of the day, so I hope the minister is listening somewhere. I hope whoever is in the House from the government side can get to the minister or the Premier and get on with that particular legislation, as it's an urgent matter.

Let's get back to Bill 98. The member for St Catharines previously during the course of debate today said this is another bill — Bill 98, about development charges and saving money, creating jobs and more accountability for the local municipalities — to benefit solely, in a hurry, developers. Mainly that's what it is, because municipalities are not truly thrilled with this thing here. As my colleague the member for Kingston and The Islands said AMO is opposed and so are many other leaders from

various municipalities. So when the minister introduced this piece of legislation, like so many other bills, and said this is an act to promote job creation, I really don't know how this is going to create jobs.

With all due respect, it is two years now and we have the Minister of Labour or development, the minister there, who has brought absolutely nothing forth in this House with respect to a job creation program or plan or proposal. They are just hoping things get better so they can look good and save themselves some of the money they need to give as a rebate to some of the richer people. So one is job creation and the other one is municipal accountability.

This is ironic because we have a government that says, "We want to give local municipalities more accountability." I wish they would make up their minds. Some municipalities know where they stand. Locally elected mayors, reeves, councillors and so forth would know exactly where they stand with the direction of this government, because up to now everything they have done is working totally against the interests of the local councils and local municipalities.

It also says for providing for the recovery of development costs related to new growth. Who is going to benefit from those recovery charges or costs? Certainly not the taxpayer and certainly not the new homeowner. It's going to go directly and quickly into the pockets of builders, developers and new house construction.

1650
When AMO is opposed to it and many leaders are opposed to it, there must be something wrong with the proposed legislation. I'll tell you, when you have Her Worship Hazel McCallion, the mayor of Mississauga, saying, "We are going to stop development in the city of Mississauga because we are being forced to use general property tax money to pay for construction of roads and other major infrastructure," and that they cannot use moneys recovered from development charges, then the title of the bill flies in the face of the government and the minister when they say to increase municipal accountability.

If this is the intent of the bill, if this is the intent of the government, then why don't they give that flexibility to the local municipalities and say: "We believe some adjustments should be made to the amount of money you're charging for new development" — that's the development charges — "but we are going to give you the flexibility, you local municipalities, mayors, politicians, duly elected by that particular municipality. You're going to apply it, you're going to spend it where you think it's best." Well, that's not the case.

In 1989, as a matter of fact, recognizing this particular problem and trying to help the construction industry and to provide developers with some additional means to provide affordable lots for construction, so they could provide more affordability on the market, they changed, they reformed the development charges and allowed — I'm pleased that the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore is in the House, because I used to get all the monthly articles, and they were wonderful, which he was writing on behalf of the Urban Development Institute/Ontario.

I have to say that I enjoyed his articles. I have a couple of them here, and I have others as well but not from the

particular member. He was fair in his assessment of the situation in the building industry and the relation to the government of the day. I have to give him credit for those wonderful articles that he was writing on behalf of the Urban Development Institute.

Before I proceed, let me quote some of the information provided to me late in 1996. The cost of servicing land or new lots and finally being passed on to a new home buyer is not the \$20,000 the minister wants us to believe is associated with direct development charges; it doesn't even amount to that, taking into consideration all the other charges.

I'll just give you some because I want to proceed with other information I'd like to bring to the House. For example, there is a processing fee for an official plan zoning amendment, and some municipalities charge more, some charge less, depending on the type of rezoning or official plan amendment. It's in the neighbourhood of \$400, based on a townhouse worth about \$160,000. There is the engineering fee of \$200. There is parkland dedication or cash in lieu, which is \$1,450. There are the actual development charges of \$6,800. There are building permit fees, again according to the municipalities, about \$1,000. There is the plumbing inspection and the water meter charges and the hydro meter charges and municipal inquiries and then GST and what have you. It is not the \$20,000 that the minister would like us to believe and say, "The price of homes is too high, is unaffordable, solely because of development charges."

Ultimately, whatever we do trickles down to one particular person, that is, the taxpayer in Ontario. It doesn't matter what we do. For example, I have yet to see any developer who owns land zoned for non-residential purposes who over the years has it rezoned and builds housing of various types who then passed on to the home buyer a cheaper cost because they enjoyed a very low price when they bought the land maybe 20, 30 or 40 years ago. Why don't they take that into consideration?

As I was saying, in 1989 the Liberal government did amend, did make changes to, did reform the development charges and allowed developers to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board if they felt the development charges of that particular local municipality were excessive. The government of the day recognized that. The development industry accepted that. I think there was a court case where some municipality was gouging developers and they appealed it and won. I guess that was the result of the reform.

Developers have that particular avenue, but now this government wants to impose on the local municipalities a restricted amount they can charge as development charges. That makes the bill totally unfair to the local municipalities.

Again I have to point out the title of the bill in which they say, "We want to give an increased municipal accountability." Well, either you do or you don't. If you want to give the local municipality that freedom and flexibility to act, to be responsible on their own within their own municipality, do not go and impose such a restrictive measure where you say, "You can only charge so much for development charges." I find that totally counterproductive.

To give you an example, a few years ago, while I was still sitting on North York city council, when times were not really that good, some big builders or developers had gone on the market and had bought every possible parcel of land for future consideration. We know what happened, of course: The economy has been lagging for a longer time and that proved to be quite a burden on many developers.

Mr Lastman and the city council took it upon themselves and said: "Look, we've got to help the local economy. We have to help the building industry, the development industry, so we have to do something about it." The city adjusted their fees accordingly to reflect those times. In many cases they completely eliminated the development charges. That's what I call responsible government at the local level, at the closest level.

And do you know what? North York city council and the mayor didn't get any flak from anyone because they understood that times were tough. As long as land was sitting there unproductive, no development charges of any kind were going to come in until you had a developer come the counter at city hall and say: "I want to build. Where do I start? Where do I make my application? There is my first cheque." I think the government should understand that.

1700

You have, of all people, a person extremely respected by this government, a person extremely experienced at the local level. I am speaking of former Mayor Crombie, who has had good experience at the municipal level. I remember when he was mayor of the city of Toronto. Why doesn't the government listen to someone with authority in that particular field when he says it is wrong to do what you are doing? Again, it's how you're doing it. There is someone who is telling the government that what they are doing and how they are doing it is totally the bunk, yet they are willing to proceed with it.

As I said before, when you have the mayor of Mississauga saying, "I'm going to stop development," who is going to benefit in the end? Developers are still going to make their profit regardless of when and where they build. If they don't make so much, they're going to make a little, and I assure you, ultimately the one who is going to pay the end price, every penny added, is the homeowner.

I should add that at the present time 10% of all new construction already must come from property taxes under this Bill 98. It's forcing municipalities to shell out 10% of all new construction costs, which means for sewers, water facilities, roads, landfill, hydro, fire, police. Why is that? Why don't we leave that flexibility to the local municipalities to decide if they should be applying 10%, 20%, or nothing at all as long as those services are being provided? In addition to that, 30% for services such as libraries and social services must be paid from the general property taxes.

Why would this particular bill restrict the local municipality from using development charges for cultural, recreational and entertainment facilities, for parkland acquisitions, for providing hospitals and, if you will, to enhance their own municipality with respect to tourism and administration expenses? In the last four weeks — not that we didn't know — we have heard hundreds of taxpayers and

politicians say how well most local municipalities are run, so why can't the government give those municipalities the freedom to be responsible for what they do in their local municipalities and apply the development charges where most needed within their local municipalities?

I don't think there is anyone who doesn't say that the government closest to the people is the local government: the local mayor, the local trustee, the local councillors and so forth. If the minister recognized that, if the Premier recognized that, then why the heck don't we allow the local municipalities to conduct their own affairs, charge whatever they want according to their own needs and apply those development charge recoveries in the most needing area? It boils down that it's nothing more than a gift to developers, and it's an additional expense or tax to the taxpayers.

Just to deviate from my notes here, let me pass some information again with respect to the end result, which is whoever is going to be renting that particular unit or buying that particular unit. When we say cost, it's cost, because ultimately the municipality will have to get the money from somewhere, and again, it's that poor homeowner or that poor tenant who will have to pay the differences. They will be asking for new municipal recreational fees.

The information I'm giving you is related to a family of two working people earning somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$55,000 per year. This is what it would cost a family of two working people with earnings of about \$50,000: recreational fees, an additional \$30; new garbage fees, \$50; new water fees, \$100; increased municipal property taxes — and yes, the municipal taxes will go up — are very low, \$30; school board taxes, another \$30; one student transit fee, \$264; increased cost of three adult transit passes, \$180; and increased tuition for one student at university, \$490.

I say this because that cost which we are forcing on the local municipality, the local municipality has to pass on to someone else, and ultimately it's the taxpayer. I wonder why the province would want to force the local municipality, twisting the local municipality to either increase taxes or lower services. I'm afraid in most cases, they will have to do both.

We oppose the content of this bill for the reasons that have been mentioned and for those that I haven't mentioned so far myself. There is no reason that the government should proceed in the way it has done, speeding the legislation on this particular bill. Even when you have good Conservatives such as Mr Don Cousens, the former Conservative finance critic and now mayor of Markham —

Mr Gerretsen: What did he say?

Mr Sergio: He said that taxes will rise and that the government, practically, is catering to the development industry. Does that mean the government is so bent that now it's taking orders from the development industry and it has forgotten the one and only taxpayer? Who is going to be the winner in all of this? Developers; not taxpayers, not homeowners, because new homes are still going up.

I think the government should really pay heed to what Mr Crombie had to say. I don't know if this has been brought to the attention of the House, but it's worthwhile

that I do again just in case it hasn't. Let me read this. This comes from David Crombie of the Who Does What panel:

"Development charges are a critical and essential municipal revenue source for financing growth-related capital infrastructure. Any amendments to the act to reduce the scope or permitted level of development charges will mean higher municipal taxes or user fees. It is also noted that the permissive nature of the act does not obligate municipalities to impose a development charge. For these reasons, this panel strongly recommends that the municipalities should continue to decide on the level of development charges in accordance with the act."

1710

This comes from Mr Crombie, but what about the Association of Municipalities of Ontario? Again, because my time is coming quickly to an end, the government must pay attention to what it is doing to the building industry, not favouring one side at the expense of another. Take, for example, the law that we have to impose on the people of Ontario. Today, for example, just briefly, when the minister says, "We are going to cooperate with the local municipalities," does this mean that they are listening to the local municipalities? Who are the local municipalities? It is people. If the proposed legislation is not fair, if it is not right to impose it on the local municipalities, surely the minister, the Premier, the government must understand that it's not right to impose it on the people.

I hope the results of today's so-called megacity will really get the minister and the government to pay some attention and use the result, the voice of the people, even in some other areas such as this particular law.

Ultimately, Madam Speaker — and that's okay. I can appreciate; you carry on discussion with our friend Peter. I'm used to speaking in the House and everybody's conducting their business. This is the political life here. But I can see that there are some members in the House and I can see that there are a couple of ministers and they are listening, and I think it's important. I think that is good and I hope they take the information that the opposition is offering to the government side, because quite often even at the committee level, for example, we hear some government members saying: "You people don't have anything to offer. You just criticize but don't offer any alternative to what we are proposing." Well, we are.

When we have a government that consistently keeps on introducing bills, laws, that do not make any sense solely because they have not been well thought out — and the megacity bill is just one of those examples. It came out of the blue without thinking how this would affect the people within Metropolitan Toronto and indirectly even the people out of Toronto. This is another one here. So we are saying we have good information that we want to pass along to you, but you have to listen.

Are they listening, Madam Speaker? They are not listening. Is the minister listening? I really do hope the members present in the House, especially the minister, will be able to bring the information to their caucus and say: "Look, this is not only us. We have the industry out here as well that is saying no." But above all, I think what the government must understand is the government must not speak from both sides of its mouth when it says,

"We are going to introduce and approve this bill, Bill 98, because we want to give local municipalities increased accountability," and then introduce a bill like this.

A bill like this ties the local municipality's hands completely. At the local municipality, they don't just have to build a road and curbs, but bring in hydro and bring in all the other services. A community, especially a new community — and we are not talking here within Metro, because Metro is saturated, if you will. You may have a little pocket, you may have an infill here and there, but you don't have any more large tracts of land where you have to bring in all kinds of services and build hundreds and thousands of homes. We don't have that any more in Metro.

But a municipality has the responsibility to bring in other services essential to the future life of those particular communities. Even if they are sidewalks, it's part and parcel of that infrastructure, for the safety of pedestrians, for example. They will have to provide new fire stations in those communities. They will have to provide new schools. They will have to provide hospitals. They will have to provide libraries. So why aren't we allowing the local municipality, saying: "As long as you have responsible local government, you should have the choice to charge whatever you feel is right, whatever you feel is important, whatever you feel is necessary to provide services to your local community and especially the new communities"? And so it should be.

I don't think that we should deny the government when even the government says, "We have to eliminate the red tape." My goodness, this is a government that wants to eliminate red tape and here we are imposing more restrictions on the local municipalities. I find this totally unfair, totally illogical. I think the reason why most municipalities are so responsible is because the people are there to control it, to attend meetings with their own local councillors in their own community and let them know what's right and what's wrong.

At the present time — and I know my seconds are running out — developers have the revenue. If they think a local municipality is gouging them, they can go for an appeal and have the development charges lowered. I think that's the way it should be. As long as an avenue is given to those developers or builders, construction, speculators, land owners, to make sure they are being treated fairly by the local municipality, that's the way we should keep it and not impose by force any restrictions on the local municipality. That's when these relations are often untenable, and if the government wants really to serve the local communities, that's what they should do.

The Acting Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): I've been listening carefully to the member for Yorkview. It's unfortunate that the Conservative backbenchers aren't prepared to do the same, because it's the insights of the member for Yorkview and others who will be addressing this most unpleasant attack on property taxpayers which the government backbenchers should be paying a little more heed to.

Talk about being in the back pockets of the big developers. This government is so deep in the back pockets of the big-money corporate developers they're spitting out lint.

The Acting Speaker: Member for Welland-Thorold, you have to withdraw that. Would you withdraw that, please.

Mr Kormos: The back pocket part or spitting it out?

The Acting Speaker: Will you withdraw?

Mr Kormos: I'll withdraw it, Speaker. You didn't seem to mind that when I was accusing the Liberal government of that with respect to the auto insurance industry. But fine, if your sensitivities are offended, I'll withdraw that, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Kormos: But the people out there know what I'm talking about. They know who's in the back pocket of the big corporate development industry, so deep in their back pockets that they're spitting out lint. They know that this bill is all about attacking working people and attacking property taxpayers to give yet another break to the corporate friends, the corporate benefactors of this gaggle of Tories that have taken over Queen's Park and exorcised it, I'll tell you, of democracy. This government wouldn't know democracy if it bit them on the nose.

We see what they're doing to the GTA — well, to Toronto and the cities surrounding it by — imposing their megacity bill, and now they're imposing upon communities across Ontario the will of the big corporate developers. Somebody's got to be on the take here. I'm not going to suggest that it's the government because that would be unparliamentary, but draw your own conclusions. People out there are.

1720

Mr Spina: I just want to address a couple of points made by both the member for Kingston and The Islands and the member for Yorkview.

First, he said that a 24% increase in the mill rate would occur in Brampton. Well, tonight on my cable show I will have the chair of the budget committee and the CAO of the region of Peel. Both have publicly declared a 0% mill rate increase for the 1997-98 budget and in fact project an even better situation for the year 1999-2000.

The real payback is this —

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: Would the member for Kingston and The Islands come to order.

Mr Spina: The real payback is this: The former mayor of Kingston says he's proud of the fact that Kingston had no development charges, and I compliment them on that. The reason is that development charges, which I think were a beast created by the Liberal government in the mid-1980s, was really something that became an outlandish crutch for municipalities to be able to suck on business, to be able to spend on frivolous services.

Let me give you the example: They may lose money in development charges but the real payback is in the development that will occur and the jobs that will be created.

A quick anecdote: The Chrysler plant in my own riding had a major expansion and was going to incur an \$800,000 development charge for nothing. The city services were already there. The costs were already paid for in the original development of the plant. It was a useless charge; some 250 jobs almost lost.

The Acting Speaker: Your time is up. Questions or comments?

Mr Bradley: I want to compliment the member for Yorkview and the member for Kingston and The Islands for outlining for this Legislature the ramifications of this bill. They recognize, as Hazel McCallion does, that this is a real problem, as so many municipal mayors and councilors understand, like Don Cousens, who used to sit in this Legislature. Don must be beside himself right now over what this government is doing, because he wasn't one of the arch right-wingers who now sit on the government benches.

We have to understand that this government is downloading on to municipalities not only the onerous responsibilities for areas over which they had no jurisdiction, or only partial jurisdiction, in the past, but at the same time they are downloading the substantial costs.

Municipalities trying to cope with this at least had the availability of development charges to meet some of these costs. Now that is being taken away, so the choice will become even more difficult now for them. They'll either have to cut essential services — and of course when you cut essential services, it's lower- and medium-income people who are affected, not the rich who can buy these services for themselves — or they'll have to raise municipal property taxes that do not take into account a person's ability to pay, whereas of course they're cutting the income tax, which benefits the richest people in this province the very most.

They're attacking municipal councillors on this. I can tell you, I've listened to members of Conservative caucus say municipalities were abusing this; when I ask them, they won't name the municipalities. So either they aren't abusing it or they're afraid to name those municipalities. We could see some user fees, which again affect low-income people the most, or we can see a cut in services, as I say.

This is just a friend-of-the-developers bill. They'll have to build bigger halls in Ontario to hold the Conservative fund-raisers because the developers will be knocking down the walls.

Mrs Boyd: I want to congratulate the member for Kingston and The Islands and the member for Yorkview for their very thorough review of the kind of reasoning behind this particular bill and the real concerns that both opposition parties have to the way in which the government is proceeding.

It is important for us to recognize that these two speakers come from very different parts of the province and different urban situations and yet they both share a very strong concern that is similar. I think it's important for us to understand that this concern is felt by those all over the province who really see this bill as an effort on the part of the Conservative government to win support from the development community. It is not, as it has been characterized by members like the member for Durham Centre, a way to guarantee that young families are going to be able to afford houses. We challenge the members to show us any instance where a decrease in this kind of cost can really be expected to result in lower costs to the people who are buying those houses.

Another issue is that development charges, as the member for Durham Centre said a while ago, are there to build the infrastructure that's needed for communities. He suggested that somehow that didn't have anything to do with the families who were going to be living in those communities. That is absolutely the wrong notion. The member for Yorkview, because of his riding, is well equipped to tell us what happens when communities grow up without the appropriate social, recreational structures. The problems in his riding largely result from the lack of those facilities within the riding he represents. I congratulate both of these members on their talks.

Mr Gerretsen: I thank the other members and my colleague from Yorkview for entering into this debate. Particularly with respect to the member for Brampton North, what he fails to totally understand is that if you leave it up to individual municipalities, they will best determine what they could charge and what the financial outlay is going to be for them.

Obviously they haven't taken into account this particular act in their budgeting for this year, because it hasn't been passed yet — or is this one of those other arrogant moves, that we already assume something is legislation before it has gone through the legislative process?

While I'm up on my feet, let me just congratulate the member for Frontenac-Addington. He was loudly hailed in our local newspaper in an editorial for joining the opposition and taking on his harsh and callous government on the hospital cuts. I want the people of Ontario to know that there are five other Tories in this House, including the member for Frontenac-Addington, who have attacked their own government on the hospital cuts and they're saying to their government, "Don't do that."

Interjection.

Mr Gerretsen: You voted in favour of the resolution. Don't try to deny it now, Bill. You got a tremendous editorial in the Kingston Whig-Standard that I'm sure you will be quoting in the next election, so take it for what it's worth. You voted against the government and the downgrading of services and the tremendous hospital cuts we're currently involved with, and I will certainly remind you of that, as will many others I'm sure in the days to come.

I would just like to thank everyone for having been involved in this debate and once again remind the members that if you truly believe in an equal partnership with municipalities, if you truly believe in that, then let the municipalities deal with the developers alone. They're elected by people; they know what's best for their municipalities. They don't need the interference from the provincial government.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Margaret Marland): Further debate? The member for Fort York.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): Thank you, Adam Speaker, and welcome to the Speaker's chair. It is good to have you there.

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to this act, as they call it, An Act to promote job creation and increased municipal accountability while providing for the recovery of development costs related to new growth — the Development Charges Act.

30

This particular bill is an act that serves the developers and only the developers. This is an act that has been

influenced by the Urban Development Institute and, as a result, this government has acted very quickly. In the same way that they have titled this act, they've titled so many other acts as well. It's germane when I refer to a number of other acts that this government has passed — and I know you're listening attentively to what I'm about to say — another act called the Tenant Protection Act. You will recall that. Each title has something that appears to be speaking to something that is good: in this case to promote job creation, in this case the recovery of development costs and somehow that is going to be fair to somebody.

So too with the so-called Tenant Protection Act: it makes it appear that there's something in it for tenants. This act makes it appear like there's something in it for the young people who are about to buy new homes. I will show why that is likely not to happen, just as I have shown in past discussions around the Tenant Protection Act that there is nothing in that bill to protect tenants. In fact, it belies all of what it presupposes to do. It does the very opposite of what the title suggests.

You will recall that in that act, the Tenant Protection Act, the developers were there already. What you will see is that the developers are constantly in the shadows of this government. When you see the little marionettes in this House moving their right arm or the left hand, it has a lot to do with the shadow cabinet behind them. That shadow cabinet behind them is made up of developers and the rich corporate raiders who have a lot to do and a lot to say to this particular government. They are guided by them constantly.

In the Tenant Protection Act you see that undercurrent. You see the influence. You see the shadows of these corporate raiders and these developers behind them. You see them acting behind them, and all the little marionettes have to do is simply put up their right hand when appropriate or their left hand when appropriate. That's what we got.

The developers and the landlords came to this government and they said to this government, "You've got to get rid of rent control," and this government acted quickly. They wasted no time. Who do you think convinced and forced — perhaps not forced Mike Harris, because he was a willing instrument of these developers and landlords, so I shouldn't say forced. He was quite happy to do their bidding. As the developers and this fine institution called the Urban Development Institute went to them, Mike Harris said, "We will act quickly on your behalf," because their interests are very much the same. They said, "Rent control prohibits us from building housing that is desperately needed."

You had deputation after deputation, including some developers who were honest enough to speak to this, saying that simply removing rent control, as they are doing through the decontrolling mechanism of getting rid of the protection we now have, forcing individuals who move to pay any price that a new landlord where they are about to go would charge, would be a giveaway to the landlord and the least protection to the tenant. That decontrolling mechanism is, in effect, the elimination of rent control as we understand it, and that has been influenced by the developer, the landlord, who said, "If you do that, we will build."

If you listen to M. Harris and his gang of disciples around here, they say the same thing. These Harrisites say the same thing: "When we get rid of rent control, we will build." But the developers themselves have said to us that it isn't enough, that to simply eliminate rent control is not sufficient for them to build. They need more, and they'll come back to you in due course because they need a lot more from government in order for them to build affordable housing.

These fine folks, developers, are not there to build housing for those who need it. They're not there to build affordable housing for poor working people. That's not what it's about. Because if they made a profit in doing so, they would be building. That's why you see them building condominiums, because that's where the pecunia is. The pecunia is in the building of condominiums. It isn't in building poor housing.

When I asked the question to those fine developers, I said: "Who worries for the public interest? Who worries for those people who can't afford to have a house?" He said, "It's none of our business," and I said to him, "But if it's none of your business and it is not in the business of this government because they want to get out of the housing business, who takes care of them?" says M. Bonhomme, M. Beauchamps, M. Beaubien.

Interjection.

M. Marchese : Il nous dit, c'est lui qui va protéger les intérêts des pauvres ici. C'est ce qu'il a dit. M. Harris et M. Beaubien vont protéger l'intérêt des pauvres ici. Est-ce que vous, mes chers amis en Ontario, croyez que M. Beaubien va protéger vos intérêts ?

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member to speak —

M. Marchese : Madame la Présidente, je vous dis non.

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the member —

Mr Marchese: I'm addressing you, Madam Chair, through you.

The Acting Speaker: — to make your comments through the Chair and not call other members by their name, other than their riding name.

Mr Marchese: I'm always speaking through you, Madam Speaker, as I speak to the members opposite, and I will find —

Mrs Boyd: The member for Lambton.

Mr Marchese: — the member for Lambton, M. Beaubien, qui va protéger les intérêts des pauvres. Je vous demande, Madame la Présidente, est-ce que vous croyez que ce député lui-même va protéger les intérêts des pauvres ? Moi, je ne le crois pas. Et je pense que les gens de l'Ontario ne le croient pas non plus. Ils ne croient pas que ce monsieur-là va les aider et ils ne croient pas que M. Harris va les aider, parce qu'ils savent que ce gouvernement n'est pas là pour eux. Ils le savent.

The member for Lambton, you're not there for them. Harris isn't there for them. Would you be there for them? He's got the wheels; you don't have the wheels. You are but a Harrisite who is driven like a marionette by M. Harris, and in this case by the developers and the corporate raiders and the corporate interests. That's what this is about. We've seen it in the rent control, the so-called tenant protection package, moving in the back scenes as a shadow cabinet saying: "M. Harris, help us out. We will

build for you. Help us out. Get rid of rent control." That's the first step. We have seen the various steps that this government is taking as they listen to these developers, and rent control was the first act of Messrs Harris and Leach to begin the devastation against our province and our people who can least protect themselves.

We are losing control of what governments have stood for and have been there for in the past. We're losing it because this government says they want to get out of that particular field. They want the red tape cut. We know what red tape cuts mean. We know when Harris speaks about cutting red tape that he is there to assist as a willing instrument those who want to profit more.

We see it in the amalgamation process of Bill 103. The same group, the Urban Development Institute, of which Mr Kells was a president came and said, "We love 103." Do you know why they love the amalgamation bill titled Bill 103? They like it because these poor people who don't have any money, these developers, they have to go to the various cities of Toronto separately, go to Etobicoke — you're a bit outside — go to North York and York and Scarborough. These poor developers, who don't have the means, have to go separately to these municipalities to seek changes in planning in order to build, and they said, "We've got to go to Metro as well." That's seven governments. Imagine that. These poor developers who don't have the means have to go to each city for planning purposes to get some development to happen, and so they said: "We're very happy that you're getting rid of these cities because all we now have to do is to go to one big megacity for development purposes."

Isn't it nice. Isn't it wonderful that we are there to assist the developers, because as I was saying, they're scratching; they've got empty pockets these days. They haven't been making enough money and they're poor, so they needed this government to whack people on social assistance with a 22% cut so they could help their developer friends who are starving out there. They're not making enough money; they're starving. They helped the developers by whacking people on social assistance with a 22% cut.

1740

It is sad to witness the daily uncorking of bills that this government is introducing that do nothing to assist those who are disfranchised but do a lot to assist those who have wealth, privilege and power, who indeed are operating the marionettes of this government.

We see in Bill 103 that developers gain, because it cuts the red tape for those individuals. But in terms of local democracy, in terms of having control and a say and in terms of being able to influence, local governments will have lost that, subjecting ourselves, as one of these researchers, Wendell Cox, said, to greater influence by a special interest group, which he quite clearly knew was the wealthier groups, people like the developers, who have the money to influence such a megacity with their power and money. He knew that. Mr Cox, this American researcher — not by any stretch of imagination that I'm aware of a social-democrat type but one of them — knows that amalgamation supports developers and those powerful interest groups but it does not support the little people, which is most of us.

Even those who consider themselves skilled and middle class, we are becoming a diminishing group of people under this government and under the federal Liberal government, I would add. We are becoming extinct as a class, because more and more you see middle class, those of you who define yourselves as such, slipping on that slippery slope of greater impoverishment in this province.

We see something else. M. Leach, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, acted unilaterally last year to do two things: one, to eliminate the basement drainage protection rules. He did something else; he eliminated the full-height insulation requirement. I say he did that unilaterally, because it's significant that he did that. At no time in our history that I am aware of did a minister, on the urging of a shadow cabinet such as the Urban Development Institute — on their urging, this minister in this government eliminated the full-height basement insulation requirement and the drainage protection rules, on his own.

In the past, you would have a great deal of consultation that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing would be engaged in, seeking input from people in the field, which would include developers but it would include everybody in the field, seeking comment, after which their feedback would be fed back again so they would have the benefit of what other people in a similar profession would have said. Having done that and their feedback once again to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, they would respond appropriately, but never politically, that I am aware of. This is the field where you would do things right, not based on politics, as this government continues to do, but rather on what is appropriate to do in the field of the building codes.

The building codes, I repeat, have always been free, by and large, of political influence. But we know that the minister met with a few developers, most of whom are connected to the Urban Development Institute, of which Mr Kells was a former president, and they urged the minister and Mike Harris to get rid of those two important protections that we had. I say it's shameful, Madam Speaker, and you should be worried yourself as a member from Mississauga about that particular move that this minister has made because, I want to tell you, this affects new tenants or people who buy houses in Mississauga. How does it affect them? I will show you how it affects them.

These developers came to Mr Leach and said, "If you remove the full-height insulation requirement and you relax the basement drainage protection rules, a homeowner who buys a new home is likely to save anywhere from \$1,000 to \$3,000." That's what they said. You know what that means, Madam Speaker, and I will show in a second that there were no savings, but it means that that new home owner, had they built the house correctly by having the insulation installed at the beginning of the process as that foundation was being built, would have saved thousands and thousands of dollars with a mere \$1,000 or \$2,000.

Now that this minister has eliminated that protection, the person who owns this home is going to have to install, on his or her own, the insulation that should be there to give them the energy protection they need. It will cost them thousands of dollars to redo that process on their

own, where if it were part of the whole building process from the beginning, it would be a negligible cost.

So too with drainage. Why do we have a water barrier on the outside of the house? To prevent water from getting into the basement. We know, don't we, member from Kingston, that water seeps into the basement because many of these homes don't have the proper drainage protection. That's why it was done in the first place, but this minister talked with his developer friends over lunch, probably at one of these fine restaurants that M. Eves eats at, and they talked about how to reduce the red tape so these people can build more housing and save new home owners money, and they said, "Okay, we'll do it." But did they save money? I ask you, did they save money? We on this side know that they didn't save money.

I've got here in my hands a document from the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, which brings together many groups, by the way, that are worried about what this government has done to the relaxing of the Ontario building code rules unilaterally and are worried about what this government is about to do very shortly with the changes to the building code that will affect energy and energy conservation in the way that we construct houses. This group, called the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, said this — Speaker, it's important, because I know you're listening. The others are not, but for your interest:

"Additionally, a survey of home builders to be released at the news conference," which they held a couple of months ago, "will reveal that an earlier revocation of another energy efficiency standard last summer," of which I just spoke, "did not reduce the price tag of a new home by \$1,000, as the minister," Mr Leach, Minister of Housing, "had claimed it would." In fact, the survey shows the prices being charged for these less energy-efficient houses are higher.

Do you remember? Ted, do you remember? Your member for Oxford said, "This is going to save money." That's what he said: "It's going to save money to the new home owner." He's not here at the moment. He's busy. He's working things out with Minister Leach. But listen, Ted: For your interest, the guy said that home owners are going to save money.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Fort York — Mr Marchese: Through you, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: If you would address your comments through the Chair and refer to members by their riding. Thank you.

Mr Marchese: I appreciate the intervention, Madam Chair. Thank you very much.

The member for Oxford said that people are going to save money. That's what they said when they eliminated the full-height insulation requirement, and that's what Leach said when he said, "We're going to relax the basement drainage protection rules."

1750

These people have done a survey and they checked it out, because this government doesn't like facts and research and proof. If it doesn't seem to agree with them, they discard it or simply dispense with it. So this group, the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, did the research and they called around to check it out, to check out the

evidence, to see whether or not the member for Oxford might be correct when he says there are going to be savings.

We have discovered, lo and behold, there are no savings. Are you to believe yet again this Tory reform government, the instrument of the developers' wishes? Are you going to believe them when they say this is an act to promote job creation, more accountability and savings and fairness for the new homeowner? Are you going to believe it?

Mr Flaherty: Are you deaf? What are you yelling for? Something's wrong with the guy.

Mr Marchese: The member for Durham Centre, poor man, is becoming hysterical at what I'm saying, and he should be. The member for Durham Centre should be hysterical because —

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr Marchese: I'm interrupting the poor fellow from Durham Centre. The poor member for Durham Centre is trying to read as I'm speaking, so my loudness — as the Speaker called it, vociferousness — is interrupting his reading. I hope I'm not overly interrupting or intervening in his pleasure in this House.

The Acting Speaker: Member for Fort York, I would suggest you might have less trouble if you didn't refer to the members opposite during your debate.

Mr Marchese: But the fellow doesn't like my vociferousness, and I appreciate that, because he's trying to read. I know he doesn't want to listen to what I'm saying. I understand that what I'm saying is hurting his sensitivities, and the loudness and the passion are affecting the poor man's intelligence. I understand that, but it bothers me a little bit.

The question is this, M Beaubien, mon ami, the member for Lambton — I'm going to whisper because I don't want to interrupt my friend from Durham Centre. It would be unfair to him. I'm going to whisper a little bit for his benefit.

Member for Durham Centre, you say your minister said there were going to be savings of \$1,000 to \$3,000. Are you listening, member for Durham Centre? Do you remember your government said there were going to be savings? I've just shown, through a survey that the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance has done, that there were no savings. So what are we to do? What are we to believe? Am I whispering enough for him, Madam Speaker? What are we to believe? You've got to believe a government when it tells you there are going to be savings. I wanted to believe them. So did these people. They want to believe this government. So we checked it out and there are no savings.

Now the government comes up with a new scheme: this act to promote job creation, Bill 109, and this new scheme they say is going to save money, loads of money for these young people, these young homeowners who want to own a home. He says, "We're here as a government to help you out."

The developers had a good lunch with M Leach and the others and they talked about the problems and they said:

"Get rid of development charges. They're bad because they restrict us from building." It hasn't really restricted them from building but that's what they say: "If you take up this development charge, those homeowners, who we're trying to help" — these developers are trying to help the homeowners — "are not going to be able to afford our homes because these development charges are so excessive. In fact they range up to \$20,000 in some places." That's not the case, by the way. They do vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, they're not homogeneous across the board, but to make the worst-case scenario, they say, "Some of these development charges are up to \$20,000." My God, can you hear it out there? Up to \$20,000. We've got to get rid of these development charges, otherwise these poor young people are not going to be able to afford it. If we then take what we have from our previous example that there are going to be savings, we have proved there are no savings.

And you know what, Madam Speaker? The developers, who I think are your friends too, pocket that extra \$1,000 to \$2,000. They pocket it because, you see, they're impoverished and they're not making enough money. They're starving; the developers are starving. That money that was supposed to go to the homeowner is being pocketed by them so they can continue to build more homes and make more money. That's really what this is all about.

Do you know something else? I've got another minute; I'll continue tomorrow. They want to reduce the insulation requirements in new building code changes. This organization, the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, is very worried about that.

Am I whispering enough for the member for Durham Centre? Is it okay now?

The Acting Speaker: Proceed with the debate.

Mr Marchese: They're worried because they say the building code changes have been made in unprecedented fashion, ignoring the views of experts and manufacturers and consumers. They're worried because if the proposed reductions in energy efficiency are adopted by this change that the minister is doing behind the scenes, new homes in Ontario will be 25% more polluting than the same house purchased only last summer. Would you listen to that? If Leach cuts the red tape for these developers, the new homeowner is going to suffer. We're going to have an energy efficiency problem as it's going to cost more because he's relaxing the rules around what makes our homes more energy-efficient. We've got a problem on our hands; we've got a problem that needs to be dealt with.

Seeing that it's close to 6 o'clock, I will continue with this, whispering so as not to bother the member for Durham Centre and getting loud when he's not here so that others can hear me. I will continue with this, Madam Speaker, the following day. Thank you very much for your attention.

The Acting Speaker: It being 6 of the clock, the House stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow, Tuesday.

The House adjourned at 1758.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston

Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Chris Stockwell

Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals / Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees / Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Agostino, Dominic	Hamilton East / -Est	L	
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Baird, John R.	Nepean	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Travail
Barrett, Toby	Norfolk	PC	
Bartolucci, Rick	Sudbury	L	
Bassett, Isabel	St Andrew-St Patrick	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance, deputy government House leader / adjointe parlementaire du ministre des Finances, chef parlementaire adjointe du gouvernement
Beaubien, Marcel	Lambton	PC	parliamentary assistant (rural affairs) to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Affaires rurales) du ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South / -Sud	ND	deputy New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Boushy, Dave	Sarnia	PC	
Boyd, Marion	London Centre / -Centre	ND	
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	L	deputy opposition leader, opposition House leader / chef adjoint de l'opposition, chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Brown, Jim	Scarborough West / -Ouest	PC	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	L	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur général et du ministre des Services correctionnels
Carroll, Jack	Chatham-Kent	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Castrilli, Annamarie	Downsview	L	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West / -Ouest	L	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre / -Centre	ND	
Hudleigh, Ted	Halton North / -Nord	PC	
Hurley, Marilyn	Riverdale	ND	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Leary, John C.	Cornwall	L	
Lelement, Tony	Brampton South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Premier / adjointe parlementaire du premier ministre
ollé, Mike	Oakwood	L	
onway, Sean G.	Renfrew North / -Nord	L	
ordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
rozier, Bruce	Essex South / -Sud	L	
unningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne	London North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
arling, Alvin	Scarborough North / -Nord	L	deputy opposition House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Danford, Harry	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	parliamentary assistant (agriculture and food) to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire (secteurs Agriculture et Alimentation) du ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
DeFaria, Carl	Mississauga East / -Est	PC	
Doyle, Ed	Wentworth East / -Est	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Duncan, Dwight	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet	Durham West / -Ouest	PC	Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Elliott, Brenda	Guelph	PC	
Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Fisher, Barbara	Bruce	PC	
Flaherty, Jim	Durham Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ford, Douglas B.	Etobicoke-Humber	PC	
Fox, Gary	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings / Prince Edward-Lennox-Hastings-Sud	PC	
Froese, Tom	St Catharines-Brock	PC	
Galt, Doug	Northumberland	PC	parliamentary assistant (environment) to the Minister of Environment and Energy / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Environnement) de la ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Gerretsen, John	Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	L	chief opposition whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Gilchrist, Steve	Scarborough East / -Est	PC	parliamentary assistant (municipal affairs – urban) to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire (Affaires municipales – secteur urbain) du ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East / -Est	L	
Gravelle, Michael	Port Arthur	L	
Grimmett, Bill	Muskoka-Georgian Bay / Muskoka-Baie-Georgienne	PC	parliamentary assistant (tourism) to the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Tourisme) du ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Guzzo, Garry J.	Ottawa-Rideau	PC	parliamentary assistant (energy) to the Minister of Environment and Energy / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Énergie) de la ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	ND	Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Hardeman, Ernie	Oxford	PC	parliamentary assistant (municipal affairs – rural) to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire (Affaires municipales – secteur rural) du ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Harnick, Hon / L'hon Charles	Willowdale	PC	Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif
Hastings, John	Etobicoke-Rexdale	PC	
Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris	Victoria-Haliburton	PC	Minister of Natural Resources, Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre des Richesses naturelles, ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Hoy, Pat	Essex-Kent	L	
Hudak, Tim	Niagara South / -Sud	PC	
Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron	Burlington South / -Sud	PC	Minister without Portfolio (Seniors Issues) / ministre sans portefeuille (affaires des personnes âgées)
Johns, Helen	Huron	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de la Santé

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Johnson, Bert	Perth	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Johnson, Hon / L'hon David	Don Mills	PC	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Johnson, Ron	Brantford	PC	
Jordan, W. Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement
Kells, Morley	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	PC	
Kennedy, Gerard	York South / -Sud	L	
Klees, Frank	York-Mackenzie	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Richesses naturelles
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	ND	
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	L	
Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	L	
Lankin, Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	ND	chief New Democratic Party whip / whip en chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	ND	
Leach, Hon / L'hon Al	St George-St David	PC	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Leadston, Gary L.	Kitchener-Wilmot	PC	
Marchese, Rosario	Fort York	ND	
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South / -Sud	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East / -Est	ND	
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	ND	deputy New Democratic Party whip / whip adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Martiniuk, Gerry	Cambridge	PC	
Maves, Bart	Niagara Falls	PC	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South / -Sud	L	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East / -Est	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	L	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East / -Est	L	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Munro, Julia	Durham-York	PC	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey-Owen Sound	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire du ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Mushinski, Hon / L'hon Marilyn	Scarborough-Ellesmere	PC	Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs
Newman, Dan	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
North, Peter	Elgin	Ind	
O'Toole, John R.	Durham East / -Est	PC	
Ouellette, Jerry J.	Oshawa	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Transports
Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al	York Centre / -Centre	PC	Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Parker, John L.	York East / -Est	PC	
Patten, Richard	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	L	
Pettit, Trevor	Hamilton Mountain	PC	
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon / Lac-Nipigon	ND	
Preston, Peter L.	Brant-Haldimand	PC	
Pupatello, Sandra	Windsor-Sandwich	L	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	L	

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Rollins, E.J. Douglas	Quinte	PC	
Ross, Lillian	Hamilton West / -Ouest	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	
Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob	Mississauga West / -Ouest	PC	Minister without Portfolio (Privatization) / ministre sans portefeuille (privatisation)
Saunderson, Hon / L'hon William	Eglinton	PC	Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Sergio, Mario	Yorkview	L	
Shea, Derwyn	High Park-Swansea	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs
Sheehan, Frank	Lincoln	PC	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	ND	deputy New Democratic Party leader / chef adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Skarica, Toni	Wentworth North / -Nord	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Smith, Bruce	Middlesex	PC	
Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John	Mississauga North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Education and Training / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Spina, Joseph	Brampton North / -Nord	PC	parliamentary assistant (small business) to the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / adjoint parlementaire (secteur petites entreprises) du ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.	Carleton	PC	Minister of Environment and Energy / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Stewart, R. Gary	Peterborough	PC	
Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris	Etobicoke West / -Ouest	PC	Speaker / Président
Tascona, Joseph N.	Simcoe Centre / -Centre	PC	
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General / adjoint parlementaire du procureur général
Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.	Markham	PC	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	chief government whip / whip en chef du gouvernement
Vankoughnet, Bill	Frontenac-Addington	PC	
Villeneuve, Hon / L'hon Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est	PC	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Wettlaufer, Wayne	Kitchener	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	ND	New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim	Simcoe West / -Ouest	PC	Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth	Waterloo North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Wood, Bob	London South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion
Wood, Len	Cochrane North / -Nord	ND	
Young, Terence H.	Halton Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant (colleges and universities) to the Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire (secteur collèges et universités) du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Vacant	Windsor-Riverside		

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

Administration of justice / Administration de la justice

Chair / Président: Gerry Martiniuk
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ron Johnson
Robert Chiarelli, David Christopherson,
Bruce Crozier, Ed Doyle, Garry J. Guzzo,
Tim Hudak, Ron Johnson, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,
Gary L. Leadston, Gerry Martiniuk,
John L. Parker, David Ramsay, David Tilson
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Rick Bartolucci
Toby Barrett, Rick Bartolucci, Gilles Bisson,
Jim Brown, Michael A. Brown, John C. Cleary,
Morley Kells, Gerard Kennedy, Frances Lankin,
Allan K. McLean, E.J. Douglas Rollins, Frank Sheehan,
Bill Vankoughnet, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs / Finances et affaires économiques

Chair / Président: Ted Chudleigh
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tim Hudak
Isabel Bassett, Jim Brown, Ted Chudleigh,
Joseph Cordiano, Douglas B. Ford, Tim Hudak,
Monte Kwinter, Tony Martin, Gerry Martiniuk,
Gerry Phillips, Gilles Pouliot, E.J. Douglas Rollins,
Joseph Spina, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Bart Maves
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Mike Colle, Harry Danford, Jim Flaherty,
Michael Gravelle, Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese,
Bart Maves, Julia Munro, Lillian Ross,
Mario Sergio, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
Len Wood, Terence H. Young
Clerk / Greffière: Lynn Mellor

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Floyd Laughren
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony Silipo
Rick Bartolucci, Ed Doyle, Douglas B. Ford,
Gary Fox, Michael Gravelle, Bert Johnson,
Peter Kormos, Floyd Laughren, Gary L. Leadston,
Frank Miclash, Dan Newman, Peter L. Preston,
Tony Silipo, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Ted Arnott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John Hastings
Ted Arnott, Dave Boushy, Tony Clement,
Ivin Curling, Carl DeFaria, Bill Grimmett,
John Hastings, Ron Johnson, Margaret Marland,
Gilles E. Morin, Sandra Pupatello, Tony Silipo,
R. Gary Stewart, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding appears when space permits.

Ombudsman

Chair / Président: John L. Parker
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tom Froese
Carl DeFaria, Barbara Fisher, Tom Froese, Pat Hoy,
W. Leo Jordan, Jean-Marc Lalonde, Rosario Marchese,
Bill Murdoch, John R. O'Toole, John L. Parker,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart, Bill Vankoughnet,
Len Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: Bernard Grandmaître
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Richard Patten
Marcel Beaubien, Dave Boushy, Gary Carr, Brenda Elliott,
Gary Fox, Bernard Grandmaître, John Hastings,
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Shelley Martel, Richard Patten,
Gilles Pouliot, Sandra Pupatello, Derwyn Shea, Toni Skarica
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Regulations and private bills / Règlements et projets de loi privés

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Smith
Ted Arnott, Toby Barrett, Gilles Bisson, Dave Boushy,
John Gerretsen, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
Gerard Kennedy, Tony Martin, Trevor Pettit,
Lillian Ross, Tony Ruprecht, Frank Sheehan, Bruce Smith
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

Resources development / Développement des ressources

Chair / Président: Brenda Elliott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Barbara Fisher
Dominic Agostino, John R. Baird, David Christopherson,
Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Sean G. Conway,
Brenda Elliott, Barbara Fisher, Doug Galt, Pat Hoy,
Bart Maves, John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette,
Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker

Social development / Affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Annamarie Castrilli
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Dwight Duncan
Marion Boyd, Elinor Caplan, Jack Carroll,
Annamarie Castrilli, Dwight Duncan, Tom Froese,
Helen Johns, W. Leo Jordan, Lyn McLeod,
Julia Munro, Trevor Pettit, Peter L. Preston,
Bruce Smith, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions paraît si l'espace est disponible.

CONTENTS

Monday 3 March 1997

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Senior citizens	
Mr Bartolucci	7317
Ontario Ranger program	
Ms Martel	7317
Peter Norris	
Mr Stewart	7317
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Kwinter	7317
Health services restructuring	
Mrs Fisher	7318
Trucking safety legislation	
Mr Bradley	7318
Ms Lankin	7319
Scouts Canada	
Mr McLean	7319

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

International Women's Day	
Mrs Cunningham	7319
Mrs McLeod	7320
Ms Churley	7321

ORAL QUESTIONS

Education financing	
Mrs McLeod	7321
Mr Snobelen	7322
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Colle	7323
Mr David Johnson	7323
Mr Sergio	7323
Mr Ruprecht	7323
Ipperwash Provincial Park	
Mr Hampton	7324
Mr Harnick	7324, 7325
Mr Phillips	7325
Municipal referendum	
Mr Hampton	7324
Mr David Johnson	7324
Public health programs review	
Mrs Boyd	7326
Mr Wilson	7326
Services en français aux hôpitaux	
French-language hospital services	
M. Morin	7326, 7327
M. Villeneuve	7327
Mr Wilson	7327
M. Grandmaître	7327

Investigation into police shooting

Ms Churley	7328
Mr Harnick	7328
Mr Marchese	7328

Ministry study

Mr Galt	7328
Mr Villeneuve	7328

Health Services Restructuring

Commission	
Mr Conway	7329
Mr Wilson	7329

Franchise businesses

Mr Martin	7329
Mr Tsubouchi	7329

Court backlog

Mr Jim Brown	7330
Mr Harnick	7330

Long-term care

Mr Gerretsen	7330
Mr Wilson	7330

PETITIONS

Child care

Mr Ruprecht	7330
-------------	------

Municipal restructuring

Ms Churley	7331
------------	------

Macassa Lodge

Mr Pettit	7331
-----------	------

Fire safety

Mr Curling	7331
Mr Christopherson	7332

Occupational health and safety

Mr Christopherson	7331
-------------------	------

Class size

Mr Bartolucci	7331
Mr Kennedy	7332

Education legislation

Ms Churley	7331
------------	------

Services for abused women

Mr Boushy	7332
-----------	------

North York Branson Hospital

Mr Kwinter	7332
------------	------

Hospital restructuring

Mrs Pupatello	7333
---------------	------

Education reform

Mr Sergio	7333
-----------	------

SECOND READINGS

Development Charges Act, 1996,

Bill 98, Mr Leach	
Mr Hardeman	7334, 7336
Mr Sergio	7335, 7344
Mr Bradley	7336, 7348
Mrs Boyd	7336
Mr Flaherty	7336
Mr Gerretsen	7337, 7348
Mr Kormos	7348
Mr Spina	7348
Mrs Boyd	7348
Mr Marchese	7348
Debate adjourned	7351

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors

The Speaker	732
-------------	-----

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 3 mars 1997

DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

Services en français

M. Bisson	731
-----------	-----

QUESTIONS ORALES

Services en français aux hôpitaux

M. Morin	732
M. Villeneuve	732
M. Grandmaître	732

PÉTITIONS

Bibliothèques publiques

M. Lalonde	73
------------	----

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 1996 sur les redevances d'aménagement, projet de loi 98,

M. Leach	
M. Marchese	73
Débat ajourné	73



AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM

No. 172

N° 172

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 4 March 1997

Mardi 4 mars 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 4 March 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 4 mars 1997

*The House met at 1331.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): I want to address my statement directly to the Premier today. This past weekend members of the Thunder Bay District Municipal League overwhelmingly supported a resolution that called on their membership to look into the pros and cons of forming a union with the province of Manitoba.

A radical step, you might say, but one that was prompted by an extreme level of frustration being felt by our municipal leaders in northwestern Ontario. Frustration has been building as this government and the Premier continue their assault on the programs and policies that once made this province the envy of all our provincial counterparts.

The final straw was the massive downloading on our municipalities that will sadly define this special session of the Legislature.

So it was, in an attempt to do something to stop this rampaging government, that Terrace Bay town council took the dramatic step of forwarding this resolution to the membership of the municipal league, a resolution that will now go forward for discussion to the annual meeting of the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association in May.

Premier, you may wish to continue to arrogantly dismiss this action by our municipal leaders, but frankly, you simply cannot. Our mayors, reeves and councillors are simply doing their job by fighting to protect their citizens from the huge tax increases your dumping will inevitably produce.

Premier, what can you do? First of all, you can apologize to Reeve Ziegler for your rude and dismissive comments and you can directly face up to this issue by attending the NOMA convention in Fort Frances the first weekend in May. If northern Ontario really matters to this government, now is the time to —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Statements. Member for Algoma.

SCHOOL TOUR CAMPAIGN

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I rise to encourage all MPPs to attend the school day with the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation. On March 21 all MPPs are being invited to attend school for a day, along with the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

The federation is concerned that few MPPs have a real understanding of what is happening in the schools and

believes that a school visit would provide the opportunity to witness firsthand the challenges facing public education and to discuss with school staff and parents their concerns about the impact of anticipated future education cutbacks.

The school visit on the 21st is planned as a positive educational opportunity for MPPs and other community leaders, and an opportunity to raise public awareness about the extent to which important educational programs are at risk as a result of the government's changes in education and cutbacks in funding.

I challenge the members of the government side to go beyond the ledger analysis of education provided by the minister in order to see the real face of education in Ontario. Go to school on the 21st and get a bit of education about our education system.

JAKE TERMORSHUZEN

Mr Peter L. Preston (Brant-Haldimand): I rise this afternoon to honour Mr Jake Termorshuzen, Cayuga and District Lions Club citizen of the year. A husband and father of three, I can't think of anyone more deserving to be named citizen of the year.

Jake joined the Ontario Provincial Police in 1967, and in 1970 was assigned to Expo '70 in Japan, one of 14 constables to be chosen to provide security at the Ontario Pavilion. But it's his role of volunteer to the youth of Haldimand that exemplifies Jake's character.

Jake has been a minor hockey league coach, has been active in scouting for nine years, and has been an active member of the Haldimand Youth Soccer Club for 10 years. Jake joined the soccer club as a coach in 1987 and a year later became a member of the club executive. In 1992 he was assigned as overall project coordinator for the proposed 22-acre, eight-field Haldimand Youth Soccer Park in Cayuga. I am pleased to say that through the tireless efforts of Jake, the park is now open, providing a home for 1,200 members of the Haldimand Youth Soccer Club.

Ontario Provincial Police officers in general display a deep regard for the community, and even in this group of dedicated people Jake stands out. I am proud to be called his friend and I am doubly proud to present Jake Termorshuzen to the Legislature today.

Applause.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Welcome.

MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): My statement is addressed to the Premier. Yesterday the people of Metro Toronto had their say. United with one voice, a very

strong voice, their message to you and your government was clear, unequivocal and unmistakably loud. The residents of Metro Toronto have said no to Bill 103. They have said no to the process. They have said no to the unilateral actions of your government. In your own words, "Ontarians must once again feel like citizens with a stake in the public life of their province rather than as spectators who pay the bills but have little say in deciding what government does."

The people of Metro Toronto want to be part of that process. They want to have a say because they have a stake in their city. You cannot ignore the people, you cannot ignore their will, and you cannot ignore their call. They are saying withdraw Bill 103. No means no. Listen to the people and do the right thing.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I'm wearing today a button which says, "We Said No. Now Listen, Mike." The vote results for Metro Toronto I'll read for the record: Toronto 73.5%, North York 79.4%, Scarborough 81.5%, Etobicoke 70%, East York 80.8%, York 71.2%. A total of 76.1% voted no. Make no mistake about it, last night was an incredible victory for democracy in the Metro Toronto area.

Also make no mistake about this: Contrary to what the government is saying, that the vote was so high against the megacity because there's confusion out there and people have it all mixed up with downloading etc, the people out there are not stupid. This government tried to ram this down their throats by saying, "We'll cut red tape and get rid of duplication," and thought people would just buy it. They forgot to think that people are intelligent and, furthermore, that people have a good spirit about their community. This isn't just about money and cutting red tape, although the government could not prove it would indeed do that; this is a message to the government that people care about their communities and want to keep their communities. We ask the government today to work with us to come to a solution —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, member for Riverdale. I would caution the members in the House that it's out of order to wear a button. It's probably even more out of order to refer to the fact that you're wearing a button. I just caution the member for Riverdale.

1340

SARNIA RIDING

Mr Dave Boushy (Sarnia): In my riding people have often referred to the Sarnia area as one of Ontario's best kept secrets. I'm going to blow the whistle today and let everyone know what makes our community so terrific: It's the unique and special people from all walks of life who continue to demonstrate our home-town traditions of dedication to excellence — people like Allen Ping-Lun Ho, who came from Hong Kong in 1970 and studied accounting and business administration at Lambton College, one of Canada's most innovative learning institutions.

Our Premier, who recently honoured him with the 1996 Premier's Award, can attest to Mr Ho's exceptional

career achievements at DataSar and his devotion to community service through the Rotary Club and the Lambton Chinese-Canadian Association.

Then there's our own Mother Teresa, Dr Helene Shingles, who survived Nazi-occupied Germany and now operates, without any government support, Canada's only free dental clinic for seniors with no dental insurance. Dr Shingles has received many honours and most recently was invested in the Order of Canada. She officially retired as a dentist in 1976, but now sees more than 1,000 patients a year, exemplifying Sarnia's spirit of hard work and volunteerism.

Sarnia Sting captain Trevor Letowski showcased the essential life skills of teamwork and commitment as he helped Team Canada win a fifth straight gold medal in Switzerland, a very proud and emotional moment for a hockey town like ours.

Our secret's out: If you want to see dedication, caring and community spirit, the Sarnia riding is the place to go.

MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): Last night the citizens of Metro sent a very powerful and clear message to this government: "You'd better listen to what we have to say," they said. The results were clear. They said no to your megacity in a mega no vote.

I tell the members of the government and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who's sitting there across on the other side, you started off by saying you wouldn't listen to the results of any referenda because they would be largely irrelevant and it didn't matter. Even a few days ago, the referendum as considered by the Premier, as he said it, was put this way: "It will be a slam dunk for the no side and it doesn't really matter." Even as short as a few days ago the Premier said it won't matter.

We're saying to you today, listen very carefully. People feel threatened, and why do they feel threatened? Because you're threatening their way of life in Metro and across this province. People are saying to you, "You'd better listen to us." I tell backbenchers of the government, you'd better listen to everyone out there in your constituencies. What they're saying to you is: "Slow down. You're threatening our way of life. It's a life we've built in our communities, cities and towns right across this province." That's what this message was last night. You'd better listen.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): Yesterday the people of Metropolitan Toronto sent a very clear message to the Harris government. They said very clearly that they reject the amalgamation notion this government and this minister continue to persist in. This morning our leader, Howie Hampton, and our caucus put out what we believe are constructive suggestions as to how to deal now with the reality we are faced with.

We believe there needs to be change, we believe the broad public understands and accepts the need for change, but we believe that change needs to happen in a way that involves people and involves the citizens, and in

a way that deals with the very real issues we should be facing, which are, how do we govern and provide for effective services not just at the local municipal level but indeed at the regional level, and that today the region, as it applies to Toronto, is no longer just Metropolitan Toronto but is the greater Toronto area.

We have suggested and we ask the government to take seriously into account a proposal that would delay the municipal elections in the GTA for a year, that would put in place a citizens' assembly with the task of sorting out the very complicated issues that exist, but also to try to build that consensus we believe exists out there in a very real way that sorts out the governance issues at the regional level from the local level, and that brings back a report to this Legislature that could be turned into legislation to be put into law and implemented in a way that truly reflects the consensus we know can be achieved on this issue.

ELAINE BURSZTYN

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Simcoe Centre): I'd like to offer my congratulations to Elaine Bursztyn, a teacher in my riding who recently received the Prime Minister's award for excellence in teaching.

Ms Bursztyn teaches intermediate-level science and math at Prince of Wales public school in Barrie. She holds four degrees, including a PhD in immunology. She is the author of more than 20 scientific articles and has also done post-doctoral work in Finland. On top of this expertise, Elaine Bursztyn brings to her classroom an enthusiasm for learning and an excitement about science and math, two core subjects that we know are very important to our children's success.

She readily explains that she expects her students to work very hard. They in return are learning that if you're going to do something, you may as well do it the best you possibly can the first time.

Today Elaine Bursztyn is judging projects at the Prince of Wales school science fair. I expect that many of the students embarked on their research with the same interest and enthusiasm her peers say she brings to the classroom.

Many of us can recall a teacher who made a difference, a teacher who made learning fun while challenging our minds and encouraging our success. For the students of Prince of Wales, Elaine Bursztyn is that teacher.

On behalf of my constituents, I extend our congratulations and appreciation.

ESTIMATES

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable Lieutenant Governor.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1997, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

Dated Toronto, March 4, 1997.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I am here today with a message for the people of Metropolitan Toronto.

During committee hearings, at town hall meetings, in letters and phone calls to their MPPs, through public opinion surveys and in yesterday's process, the people of Metropolitan Toronto have expressed concerns on a number of different fronts.

We have been listening. Their voices were heard. We're going to reflect on the concerns we've heard and we're going to take the time to respond to make sure we have a plan that works.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order. Can I get some order in the Legislature, please?

Hon Mr Leach: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The comments and feedback from the people of Metro Toronto fall into our basic categories: (1) the effect of the Who Does What trades; (2) the impact the "one Toronto" proposal may have on property taxes; (3) the need to protect local communities and their distinct identities;

(4) the need to ensure that the process of reform respects principles of democracy, accountability and representative government.

We've been listening. Taking into account what we've heard, the government will work to respond to every concern.

First, Who Does What: We're working with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario towards our mutual goal of eliminating duplication and waste so that all levels of government can provide better services at lower cost to taxpayers. The joint provincial-municipal implementation teams are already making progress. We will continue to improve the Who Does What package in ways that work better for taxpayers, for local governments and for the province.

1350

Second, local property taxes: Mayor Mel Lastman reflected the views of many when he asked for a guarantee that taxes won't go up because of Bill 103. He has suggested that such a guarantee be enshrined in legislation. While we are confident that our proposals would lead to savings and lower costs, the mayor's suggestion deserves further consideration. We want to hear from the people on whether tax stability should be guaranteed in legislation, and if so, how.

Third, community identity: Mayor Barbara Hall and many others have stressed that any change must preserve our neighbourhoods. We agree. Clearly we need to digest what we've been hearing and, working with everyone concerned, develop improvements to our proposals that will protect and preserve local communities. We will be doing so in the coming weeks.

Fourth, the process, including the role of trustees: The most consistent message from individuals appearing before the committee was that the transition and implementation process must respect local democracy and the

role of representative local government. We agree. We want to work with the people of Metro Toronto and with local municipal officials on ways of ensuring a democratic and accountable process, so we will take the time to get it right.

The people have expressed concerns. We have heard their concerns and we are committed to resolving them. Over the next month we will reflect on what we've been hearing and respond with improvements that address each of their concerns. Working together, I am confident that by April we can produce a better balanced package that serves all of us.

The Speaker: Responses? Official opposition, the member for Oakwood.

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I think the minister still doesn't get it. Some 76% of the voters in the six municipalities of Metro yesterday overwhelmingly said no to his megacity amalgamation. They all said no to his scheme, yet he still says he's going to barge ahead, he's still going to bulldoze ahead —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I would ask the members, including the members for Oriole and Kingston and The Islands: Those signs are out of order. Those signs, yes. That sign too, as a matter of fact. That sign, yes; that sign, that sign. You see, all those signs are out of order, so as long as it takes for you to put them all down — you'll notice the clock is running for your responses.

We can continue. The member for Oakwood.

Mr Colle: This minister continues to ignore and continues to lack in respect for the voters who came out and rejected his megacity. He's still going to bulldoze ahead by April 1 — that's probably appropriate — and ram this bill through despite the fact that people all over Metro have been meeting in church basements and in city halls, rejecting his proposal.

He hasn't been listening. He refuses to acknowledge their democratic right to be heard. They have said clearly, unequivocally, no to the amalgamation of the six cities. This minister, despite a case of contempt being found against him by you, the Speaker, despite the court's ruling that he acted illegally in making the trustees above the law, despite 76% of the people rejecting amalgamation, has the unmitigated gall to say that he's going to do it anyway. He's saying that no matter what people say, no matter how many people voted, he doesn't care. This government doesn't care. Mike Harris and Al Leach are going to bulldoze ahead and destroy and risk one of the most vital, workable communities in all of Canada, if not North America.

This unmitigated attack on people's right to have a say in their future is being denied by this minister when they went through a process that this minister and his government tried to, first of all, discredit, saying they weren't going to listen to a referendum. Then they tried to disrupt it; even paid staffers were sent down to disrupt the voting at the city of Toronto. Now he's denying what the people have said.

Minister, look at the results. The people overwhelmingly, in the six communities, have said no, no, no to your megacity. They don't want it. They will not listen to your tinkering proposals, your quasi-community councils. They

want the real thing. They want real, accountable councils. They will not stand by and allow you to try and ram this thing through even after you've lost a further mandate, because this was not in the CSR.

You, as the vice-chairman of the Trimmer commission, advocated stronger local government. Now we have over 400,000 voters in Metro going out to vote, the vast majority saying no, and you still charge ahead. No wonder people are beginning to question what happened to democracy in this province when despite votes and rulings of the court you continue to say: "I don't care. I'm going to do it anyway. I'm right. All the citizens are wrong. I'm not going to listen."

People are not going to let you get away with it. They are going to continue to meet. They will continue to organize. They will continue to fight you and Mike Harris as you try to dictate your wishes upon them. They are citizens. They are mature adults who have said no to your megacity madness. You have no right and no mandate to continue down this road. You must stop and do the right thing and pull this bill. Withdraw Bill 103 today.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I'd call you to order, but I'd have a tough time calling that a demonstration. Responses? Leader of the third party.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): It's already evident that the government caucus is not listening. They mistake "No means no" for "Go, Leafs, go." It shows you how carefully they are listening to anything people are saying, and that goes for the minister and what we've just heard today, because the minister —

Interjections.

Mr Hampton: I know the government caucus does not want to hear this. I know that. That's very clear. The minister doesn't want to hear it either, but if the minister was watching last night, he would have noticed that there was a record turnout in many of the municipalities within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto, and over 76% of the people turned you down. In fact, more people voted against your proposal than voted for the Progressive Conservative Party in the 1995 election. You should pay attention to that.

You should also pay attention to the fact that they didn't just indicate mild opposition; they didn't just indicate criticism of a few items. They said very clearly no to Bill 103, no to your whole process, and if you were really listening, you would acknowledge that.

You would also acknowledge that the public will was expressed last night. The public will across the municipalities in this Metropolitan area was expressed last night, and you ought to listen to the public will. That's what democracy is all about. That's what democracy involves, listening to people, but it's clear you haven't done that.

1400

It is so sad, the path this government has had to travel to get to this point, and still they don't get it. We've had the minister cited for a prima facie case of contempt of this Legislature. We've had the government trying to use taxpayers' fax machines, breaking federal department of communications regulations regarding the use of fax machines, trying to put out a partisan campaign. We've

had them trying to use taxpayers' money to sell their message. We've had them using legislative caucus print shops to print partisan Progressive Conservative Party propaganda about this. Over and over again this government has shown contempt for the legislative process, contempt for democracy, and what do we have here today? After an overwhelming No vote, after an overwhelming expression of the public will, the minister comes in here and shows that still, once again, he is not listening; that still, once again, he does not get it.

The only thing I can say for this government is that it is somehow appropriate that this minister indicates that he wants to come back here on April 1 and try to ram this through, that he wants to start again on April Fool's Day on an agenda the people have already clearly rejected. In my view that says it all about this government: They don't want to listen to people; they don't practise democracy; they don't recognize that democracy means listening to people. So we're right back where we started from. How unfortunate.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): Let me just say that I find it really troubling that after all that's happened, the minister would not even have the decency to refer to yesterday — yesterday's process is what he called it. He doesn't even have the decency to call it a referendum, because that's what it was, and it was a clear expression of the citizens —

Interjections.

Mr Silipo: The response from the government caucus speaks volumes, Speaker, but I want to try in the short time that's left to reach the Premier, because it seems to me he's the only one who can bring any sense to this. I want to say to the Premier, if I could get his attention, that we have today put forward a constructive proposal for how to get the government out of this dilemma they've painted themselves into: We believe that the establishment of a citizens' assembly with full discussion, full consultation, together with holding off one year the municipal elections in the GTA, setting up a real process, will get us out of this morass. More important, it will help us find solutions that will help us to govern the city region into the 21st century. That's what we should be doing. We call upon the Premier to come to his senses —

The Speaker: Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My first question is for the Premier. Last night was one heck of a night for democracy in Ontario and the results are worth reviewing. In Toronto, of those who voted, 73.9% voted no; in Etobicoke, 69.7%; in York, 71.2%; in East York, 81.5%; in North York, 79.4%; and in Scarborough, 78.1%. Metro-wide we're talking about 76.1% of voters voting against the megacity.

Premier, you wanted a unified city and now you've got one. You've got six cities unified against the concept of megacity, so I've got to ask you: Did you hear the roar out there last night? Did you hear it? Did you hear the

strong vocal majority who shouted no, and more importantly, are you now going to listen and withdraw Bill 103?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): Of course we've been listening, not only last night but during the hearing process, and the number of people, the polls that have been over the weekend — we heard all kinds of people say: "We understand the need for reform. We understand you're the only government that's had the courage to move forward in a number of these areas." But they said: "We're concerned about taxes. We're concerned about other things."

So they've asked us to move, they've asked us to make the difficult decisions that have been postponed, but they've asked us to do so very carefully. They've asked us to take our time, they've asked us to make sure that we get it right, and indeed that's what we plan to do.

Mr McGuinty: They asked you to do one thing alone: They asked you to withdraw Bill 103. It's as simple as that.

Let's take a look at the government's record in these matters because it is far from spotless: (1) The government tried to ram through Bill 26, the omnibus bill;

(2) we had the Minister of Municipal Affairs being found to be *prima facie* in contempt of this Legislature; (3) we had a judge rule that the actions involved violated the fundamental principles of responsible government.

Premier, there's only one thing you could do that I could think of that would make this matter worse, only one thing you could do to worsen the record: You could tell me you're not going to withdraw Bill 103. So tell me right now that that is not true, that in fact you've decided to withdraw Bill 103.

Hon Mr Harris: We think we still have some more consultation to do and we'd like to reflect on what we have. I can tell you that —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I can tell you that already we clearly have listened far more than you or your party or your colleagues have listened. For example, on amalgamation, people are telling us that they're worried about tax increases and service cuts, that they want to keep the unique character of their neighbourhoods, they want to have strong local representation —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. We can't continue under the process, so unless there's going to be some order, I'll have to continue getting up. Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: So I think it's important that we not only reflect on the polls that were released last weekend, which actually had some scientific basis to them, we also ought to reflect on the sentiment yesterday —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: As flawed as the process was, I think it's important we do reflect on the number of people who have concerns about a number of areas. I think there are some things that are important that we must understand about that. Many people were concerned about different issues, so just to simplistically postpone, put off as you people did for 10 years — clearly we heard a message

loud and clear: "Do not procrastinate, do not do nothing but listen" —

The Speaker: Thank you. Final supplementary.

Mr McGuinty: The Premier doesn't get it: No means no. It's no more complicated than that. Bill 103 is beyond redemption. It can't be revived. It's dead. The only decent and honourable thing to do now is to withdraw it and bury it. The people voted no. There is nothing left to interpret. It was simple, straightforward and unequivocal. They said they are against turning six cities into one. End of story. They don't want amendments; they want you to withdraw Bill 103.

1410

Premier, you put forward the megacity notion and you've lost. It's time for you to pick some sides here. Either you're going to be with the people or you're going to be against them. Whose side are you on?

Hon Mr Harris: I think you will find through my whole political career, which has had some successes and some not-so-great successes, that listening carefully and being with the people and ultimately at the end of the day making difficult decisions that will bring back the heart and soul and the strength to Toronto is indeed — people will respond to that.

What we've also found out is that they didn't respond very well to five years of Liberal disaster inaction or five years of NDP-Liberal inaction. Clearly they would like people to listen carefully, they would like a very thoughtful response, they would like the kind of government that will carefully measure what they have to say and then act in their best interests. That is a dramatic change from the 10 years of disastrous government that led to a lost decade and a backwards slide in Toronto.

The Speaker: New question. Leader of the official opposition.

Mr McGuinty: My second question is for the Premier. This from a man who travelled throughout this province and told people that he was in favour of direct democracy and that he would respect the results of referenda. That was then.

Premier, people oppose megacity because they believe it's going to lead to higher property taxes; they oppose it because they believe it's going to lead to bigger and more remote government; and they oppose it because they believe it's going to lead to a loss of sense of community, that which holds them together. They oppose your megacity, and we shouldn't overlook this, because it's contrary to everything you promised during the last election. The bottom line is that people just plain oppose megacity.

Any member of this Legislature who dares to ignore the will of the people, which has been duly expressed by way of referenda held yesterday, is putting their own political career at risk. Premier, your megacity was a mistake. Will you listen to the will of the people and will you withdraw Bill 103?

Hon Mr Harris: I want to acknowledge and agree with the leader of the Liberal Party, who said what it was that people expressed last night: They're concerned about their taxes going up, they're concerned about local government, they're concerned about all those things. We believe we can respond to those things. None of those

have anything to do with whether you have one government or seven governments, but they are all, in the minds of the people who voted last night, related to making sure that whatever happens after Who Does What, whatever happens after Bill 103, whatever happens after we go from seven councils and layers of government to one, we can respond to those areas.

I agree with you. You have correctly identified what they were voting on last night. We will correctly and appropriately respond to those concerns.

Mr McGuinty: Is it any wonder that every day more and more people are losing confidence in this government? Is it any wonder? Premier, you have shown time and time again that you simply don't care about what people have got to say. Despite all the fine speeches delivered during the course of the election and prior to that about direct democracy and how you believe in the importance of referenda, you are about to ignore the clear and unequivocal results from last night's referenda.

Premier, anything short of withdrawing your megacity is going to be an affront to the people of Metropolitan Toronto. It is a complete and wanton disregard for their wishes. Some 391,689 people voted against the megacity. That's 76.1% of those who voted. We're at somewhat of a loss here. What is it going to take before you stop and listen to the majority of the people, who voted against the megacity?

Hon Mr Harris: In spite of the fact that obviously 75%, the overwhelming majority, did not vote, and in spite of the fact that those who did vote were there, in spite of all that —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Harris: In spite of the fact that those experts on referenda and on polling would say that, unfortunately, this was a good example of how not to do it if you want people to have credibility in referendums, and in spite of the fact that Dalton McGuinty, the leader of the Liberal Party, on Focus Ontario, February 1, said, "I'm not, generally speaking, a big fan of referenda," in spite of all that, I want to say directly to those who participated in the process, we intend to listen, we intend to reflect on the messages that were sent, we intend to respond and, in the fullness of time, hopefully you can put behind you that process and maybe one day we can have meaningful referenda.

The Speaker: Final supplementary, leader of the official opposition.

Mr McGuinty: There is only one meaningful response to what happened yesterday and that is to withdraw Bill 103. Premier, my questions to you today have been about the basic functioning of a democracy, about the fundamental right of citizens to have a say in how they are governed, to decide who governs them and to have elected representatives who truly represent their concerns.

You may want to plow ahead and to ignore the results of yesterday's referenda, but I'm wondering, what about the back bench? I'm wondering, are you going to allow your back bench to respect the wishes of their constituents? Are your backbenchers going to be allowed to truly represent their constituents by voting against the megacity bill, or are you going to force them to vote against the

very wishes of those who put them here in the first place?

Hon Mr Harris: I want to comment on the word "withdrew." What happened was your party for five years and the NDP for five years withdrew from responsible decision-making, you withdrew from changing the assessment system, you withdrew —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I know how difficult it is to maintain order here and I appreciate what a good job you do.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I don't think he was being provocative there. I think that's fair comment. Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. So it is because, during that lost decade, those 10 years when your party and the NDP withdrew from responsible government, withdrew from responsible decision-making, that's what led to commercial concentration tax, led to the deterioration of Toronto, led to jobs and investment leaving Toronto, led to massive increases in not only your own taxes but property taxes as well.

We are determined to do two things: to listen very carefully to what the people have to say, reflect on that, take our time, as we heard last night from a number of people, and make sure we get it right, right for Toronto.

The Speaker: New question. Leader of the third party.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My question is also for the Premier. I wonder if you realize that last night 391,689 Metro Toronto people said no to your megacity? In comparison, in the last election you received the support of only 330,000 people in Metro. If that's not a direction from the people to withdraw Bill 103, your megacity bill, I don't know what is. That's an overwhelming turnout and it was an overwhelming voice of no from people.

Today, my GTA caucus colleagues and I put forward a proposal called A Greater Toronto Area for the 21st Century, a proposal that addresses the need for change while respecting people's democratic rights. Premier, it's time to respect the people's wishes and withdraw Bill 103. Will you do the honourable thing? Will you withdraw Bill 103 now?

Hon Mr Harris: I know nobody more honourable or who listens more intently than the minister, and I'm sure he can respond.

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): What we've all heard, in the events that took place yesterday and the hearings that have taken place over the last five weeks, is that people have concerns about the changes being put forward, changes that they all agree are necessary. I think everybody agrees that the status quo is not an option. I know that the NDP have said the status quo is not an option and the Liberals have said the status quo is not an option. Change is required. I believe that the principles behind Bill 103, when you deal solely with amalgamation, are the best option for this government and for the people of Ontario and for the people of Toronto. What has happened — I've had so many people mention to me over the last few days, "I

don't have a problem with amalgamation but I do have a problem with amalgamation and property tax reform." If we could separate those issues and deal with them — and we're going to do that. We heard what people were saying and we're going to —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Supplementary?

Mr Hampton: I asked the question of the Premier for a specific reason, because frankly, I believe this minister has been totally discredited on this issue. He has shown time and time again that he is incapable of listening to people, incapable of respecting people's democratic wishes, and he's indicated already by his statements here today that he just doesn't get it, that he's not listening to people.

I'll say this again to the Premier: Our proposal, A Greater Toronto Area for the 21st Century, is intended to work with the enormous citizen interest in municipal government. It's intended to be democratic and open. It's not a status quo proposal. It's a proposal for change based on strong, accessible, responsible local government.

Premier, you should have learned a lesson from last night. It's clear the minister won't learn any lessons, but you should have learned a lesson. Will you form a citizens' assembly, as our proposal suggests, and begin a real consultation with the people who reside in the Metropolitan Toronto and the GTA regions? Will you do that? Will you begin a real process?

Hon Mr Leach: I'm sure the member of the third party would recognize that there has been a very democratic process taking place over the last number of months: the public hearings where over 600 people have had the opportunity to come in and present their views, to point out their concerns, to offer suggestions. That democratic process has allowed for input from the people of Ontario.

On top of that, we heard the results of the process that took place yesterday. We understand that people have concerns about a number of the proposals being put forward. We know that the vast majority of them approve of moving to a single city, approve of property tax reform, approve of changes in education, approve of the disentanglement process. We know that and we're going to address those areas where they have some concern over the next three or four weeks to ensure that we slow down and we do it right. That's what we intend to do.

Mr Hampton: Every time the Premier refuses to answer and every time this minister tries to answer, they simply reinforce what everyone knows: They're not listening. If this minister had been listening he would know that overwhelmingly the people who have come before the committee have not talked about amendments to Bill 103; they have very clearly said no to 103. They don't want it. They don't believe it will work. They believe it will lead not to better conditions within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto, but will take people back in terms of the direction this city needs to go in.

Minister, what's so hard to figure out here is that the Premier voted in the referendum. He obviously understood the question. The question was, "Do you want a megacity or do you not want a megacity?" All those people out there understood the question as well. They voted no. We're trying to give you an opportunity here to

move forward but to involve people. Will you show some humility, admit you were wrong, admit to the people you were wrong —

The Speaker: Thank you. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon Mr Leach: I think what I recognize here is the frustration of the opposition in dealing with a government that has the will to get the job done. There's a government sitting across there that tried to deal with this issue for five years. They tried to deal with property tax reform and they failed. They tried to deal with disentanglement and they failed. They failed at every one of the policies that we have had the ability to get up, get on the table and get action on.

We intend to carry out our agenda. It's the agenda the people of the province want carried out. They want property tax reform, they want changes in education, they want disentanglement, and we intend to bring all those issues forward and pass the legislation to make them work.

The Speaker: New question. Leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: To the Premier again, and to the Premier because it's obvious once again that this minister doesn't get it, that this minister is not listening.

Over 76% of the people who took part in the referendum, and there were record turnouts for the referendum, voted against your proposal. They didn't vote "maybe," they didn't vote "yes, well, possibly, sort of," they didn't vote for amendments, they voted clearly no, just as you voted in the referendum; just as you voted in the referendum and you understood the question, they understood the question.

I put it to you again: Will you listen to the people who care about democracy, who took part in a democratic process? Will you withdraw Bill 103? Will you go back to the drawing-board and begin a process which involves people and involves an agenda for change? Will you do that?

Hon Mr Harris: I know the minister would be pleased to respond.

Hon Mr Leach: The people of Metropolitan Toronto, and the people of Ontario for that matter, know that the status quo is not an option, so obviously we have to make changes. The changes we're proposing I think provide for a level of government that does exactly what we said we would do in the Common Sense Revolution: eliminate a layer of government, strengthen local government and create a GTA services board to deal with interregional issues. What the people have been asking for is what we're proposing to carry out.

The members across say the status quo is not an option, and yet in the five years they were there and in the five years the others were there, what did they do? They did nothing, absolutely nothing. Well, they did do something: They put us \$100 billion in debt is what they did. But as far as carrying out the agenda the people of Ontario want to see carried out is concerned, this government is doing it.

The Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Dovercourt.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I want to say to the minister, if you were to put aside your arrogance and

your continuing insults to the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto just for a few minutes, you would see that what we are suggesting is not a defence of the status quo.

1430

We are clearly saying to you, "Here is a proposal, here is a suggestion that helps you get out of the morass, out of the corner you've painted yourself into." It involves one important aspect, and that is your stopping Bill 103, withdrawing Bill 103, and setting in place a citizens' assembly that consults people and discusses with people over the next number of months on the changes to come about at the greater Toronto level and at the local level. Will you look at that, Minister? Will you do that?

Hon Mr Leach: As I mentioned earlier, the public process we're going through now is giving the people of Metropolitan Toronto an opportunity to have input into the process. The proposal that is being put forward by the NDP is a proposal that always comes forward: "Come forward, do another study and do nothing." That's what they propose to do.

We've had the public hearings. We've had 600 individuals, groups and businesses come to this Legislature and provide input into the process. The boards of trade, the Scarborough chamber of commerce, all the industries, all the people, all the municipalities involved have had an opportunity to say their piece, to voice their concerns, to offer suggestions and alternatives. We've listened to those. We will be proposing changes to this bill, changes that will address the concerns that have been addressed by the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto, and I'm sure that when all that is on the table, everyone will be quite happy with what the situation is.

Mr Silipo: This is not a proposal to study this indefinitely. What we are suggesting is a time line. Maybe the minister hasn't read it, and if he hasn't, that's fine. I would just ask him to take a look at it and consider it because we are trying to be helpful.

We are suggesting a process that involves delaying the municipal elections in the GTA for a year to ensure that change does happen, because we believe change needs to happen, but that change needs to look first and foremost, as Golden told you and as Crombie told you, at the need to coordinate services like transportation, economic development and other issues at the greater Toronto level first, and then within that and only within that look at what amalgamations and what delivery of services can be improved and strengthened at the local level.

That's what we're proposing, and the time line we have set out would ensure that happens with a delay of one year in the municipal elections, and legislation that you would be able to bring here with the support of a broad citizens' movement. That's what we're proposing. Will you take a look at that?

Hon Mr Leach: The member from the third party mentioned the Crombie recommendations and the Golden recommendations that said deal with the GTA. We are dealing with the GTA. We are setting up a process to ensure regional services are delivered across the entire GTA area. We know and recognize that you must have a strong central core and you must have a strong greater Toronto area if this community is going to work in global markets.

To continue to delay, to continue to procrastinate, to continue to have an agenda that says, "Do nothing," is not an agenda this government can live with. We know that we campaigned for a long time on change, and on the change that was necessary, on eliminating waste and duplication, on eliminating levels of government, on eliminating the number of politicians in this area. That's what this program is all about, and that's the program the people of Ontario want.

The Speaker: New question. The member for Oakwood.

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I have a question to the Premier. Premier, you've been ducking this issue from when it was first introduced. You ducked the debate in Scarborough when the other two leaders were there. You refused to allow the committee to go to the city halls when you were proposing elimination. Now you've got 76% of the voters, citizens in Metro, saying no.

How can you still sit there and not listen to them? How can you still sit there and deny all the people who have come before the committee and said, "Withdraw Bill 103"? How can you continue to display such arrogance and disregard for ordinary people who are saying, "Don't do this to my city"?

The Speaker: Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thanks, Mr Speaker. I know the minister will be pleased to answer.

Hon Mr Leach: The member talked about the hearing process, and there are first amendments that said we should move from city to city. I don't think that anybody had any difficulty getting down to the hearings that took place here over the last five weeks and that are continuing, for that matter. Everyone was accommodated. All of the spectators who wanted to attend were accommodated.

I think the democratic process of having hearings, letting people have an opportunity to speak, having the opportunity for everybody in Metropolitan Toronto to be able to see that process on television so they could form their opinions, was by far a wide democratic process that gave everybody in the greater Toronto area an opportunity to keep abreast of what was happening, to call in suggestions, to speak to their MPPs and make suggestions. That process will continue over the next few weeks because we're going to do this and we're going to do it right.

Mr Colle: This is most disappointing. The Premier keeps ducking the people of Metropolitan Toronto. I ask the Premier why he is refusing to debate this issue. Will you stay for the emergency debate about the withdrawal of Bill 103, Mr Premier? Will you go face to face with people who are saying no to your megacity? Because it's your proposal, Mr Premier. The buck stops at your door.

How do you have the right to deny people a right to be heard on what's going to happen to their cities? Why are you ducking the people of Metropolitan Toronto? Why are you hiding? Why are chickening out? Are you afraid to face the people of Toronto? Why won't you come out and debate it? Defend your megacity, Mr Premier.

Hon Mr Leach: I wonder what the member for Oakwood's position today is on amalgamation. As I've mentioned in the House before, this is a member who campaigned on amalgamation, campaigned on getting rid

of his city of York, which he now stands around and says it's impossible to do. There is absolutely no consistency there whatsoever.

What we wanted to do, as we have continued to say, is to give the people of Metropolitan Toronto an opportunity to speak. They've had that opportunity. Six hundred came to the hearings and said, "We have concerns." Many of them said, "Carry on with your agenda." The last time I was at the hearings, seven out of 10 delegates were in favour of amalgamation. I think that to say this government hasn't carried out the democratic process is absolutely wrong. The democratic process is giving them the opportunity to say their piece. We allowed that.

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a question for the Premier. Some of the members of the government party such as the honourable member for Scarborough East have said that last night's referendum vote was not just a vote against the megacity but rather a vote against the government's whole agenda.

A major part of the agenda is Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act. We've been hearing from many parents in the committee hearings who are concerned about what is happening to their children's education here in Metro and across Ontario. People like Annie Kidder, Jacqueline Latter and Gay Young have expressed concern about the loss of local representation and accountability and concerns about cuts in education that will affect their children. Parents are asking to be consulted by your government on your plan for education. They point out that you haven't even followed the Sweeney report and that you cancelled consultations on that report not long after you became the government.

My question is simple and straightforward: Will you withdraw Bill 104 and initiate province-wide consensus-building processes to develop the best plan for education in Ontario?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I appreciate the opportunity to respond about education, because the dillying and dallying and the studies and the Sweeney report that your government commissioned, and the royal commission that you commissioned and then really didn't act on very much, are some of the reasons why we are getting an increase in class size in some of the schools, which is totally unacceptable to us. We will not accept any increase in class size. Clearly those increases that took place under your government, and even the first year of our government under the failed structure that's not working very well, are not acceptable to us.

1440

Second, we heard through the royal commission and we heard through all those processes that you had, the Sweeney report, concerns about quality of education, concerns about getting resources into the classroom and —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Answer, please.

Hon Mr Harris: — concerns that the current structure was in fact not doing that. So we are responding to the concerns that were expressed to your government. You did not act, and we are acting.

Mr Wildman: The Premier's government responded to the concerns by cutting \$400 million out of education in this province.

Central to the government's restructuring package is the removal of education funding from the residential property tax. One of the excuses you've given for your downloading of social and health care services to the property tax has been the removal of education costs from the property tax. Since you've had some difficulties obviously as a result of the referendum and the transfer of soft services like health care and long-term care to the property tax, it has been suggested that one of your approaches may be to take those services and those costs back to the province and to transfer the cost of school maintenance, custodial services, transportation and so on to the municipal property tax —

The Speaker: Thank you very much, member for Algoma. Premier, response.

Hon Mr Harris: No. Our plan is to do this: Stop the erosion of education in the classroom; stop the erosion of standards; stop getting test results back that say we're seven out of 10, 10 out of 10 in math and science here in Canada. So we are bringing forward proposals.

I want to say very clearly to all members of the House and to every parent and to every businessperson concerned about the quality of graduates, and I want to say directly to every student that everything we are doing is 100% for better-quality education in the classroom.

I also want you to know this: Absolutely nothing that we are doing will affect class size or quality of education in the classroom. It is exactly those erosions over the last period of time, particularly under your administration, that we are trying to correct, and in that we have the overwhelming support of parents and of students and of businesses that are concerned about standards in this province.

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa-Rideau): My question is for the Attorney General. I read in the press this morning of problems in the provincial court (family court division), and as your department statistics will reveal, sir, this is not just the hardest-working court in this province but in the entire Dominion.

Sir, the clients of that division are people who have paid taxes in prior years and who will pay taxes in the future, as opposed to maybe clients of the immigration court who have never paid a nickel in tax in this country, and indeed in our own criminal courts some have never paid a nickel in taxes.

I'm asking you today, sir, with regard to that problem, what you are able to do to aid the people and the clients of that court.

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I had occasion this morning to speak to Chief Judge Linden, who described the article that was written as highly exaggerative of the situation. However, we do know that because there have been problems with legal aid, which is now on a sound fiscal basis, we are now taking a look, through Professor

McCamus, at reviewing legal aid and reviewing the way we deliver legal aid. I'm looking forward to receiving his report.

In the meantime, I can assure you that legal aid, which is run by the law society, is receiving exactly the amount of money that the law society agreed to accept when it made an agreement with the former government. I have every confidence that they will be able to run the legal aid system pending the outcome of Professor McCamus's review of better ways in which we might be able to deliver legal aid to those who need it.

Mr Guzzo: My supplementary deals with the expansion of the Unified Family Court. In particular I note from my own riding that the federal government has money for Bombardier and Pratt and Whitney in Montreal and for a canoe museum in the riding of Shawinigan. Indeed, the member for Shawinigan has free advice but no money with regard to hospitals in the Ottawa-Carleton area. I'm wondering if you have had any luck to pry money away from the Attorney General for the federal government with regard to expanding the unified court?

Hon Mr Harnick: I appreciate the question from the member for Ottawa-Rideau because it is a very important question. We now have the Unified Family Court in Hamilton, London, Barrie, Napanee and Kingston. It's a court that works very well. It's a court that has consolidated all of the family and matrimonial cases in one place.

I have been urging the federal minister to expand that court, particularly into Metropolitan Toronto and the GTA, and to consider expansion into northern Ontario. Certainly the experience of this court is that it works. It responds to the needs of people. It's administratively the right thing to do, and I've been urging the federal minister to expand the Unified Family Court. I hope he does, because I think it will be of great benefit to those who need the services of the family court in Ontario. I do hope the Minister of Justice federally, Mr Rock, will pay heed to our request.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

M. Gilles E. Morin (Carleton-Est) : Monsieur le Président, ma question s'adresse strictement au ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones.

Hier, au cours d'une entrevue avec un reporter de la télévision de Radio-Canada, le ministre Villeneuve a déclaré qu'il appuyait le mouvement SOS Montfort. Monsieur le Ministre, 500,000 Franco-Ontariens vous regardent en ce moment. La nation vous écoute. Puisque vous appuyez SOS Montfort, allez-vous maintenant vous opposer publiquement à la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort ?

L'hon Noble Villeneuve (ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales ; ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones) : Il me fait plaisir de répondre à mon collègue de la région de l'Outaouais ontarien. Comme vous le savez, la commission de restructuration a fait ses recommandations. Je félicite

Gisèle Lalonde et le regroupement SOS Montfort. Je les encourage fortement à faire une présentation forte pour indiquer exactement leurs nuances, leurs inquiétudes, et puis faire leurs recommandations pour une solution.

Alors, je les appuie fortement. Comme vous savez, les recommandations de la commission sont absolument les leurs et n'ont absolument rien à faire avec le gouvernement ontarien. Alors, je les encourage. Ils ont encore une vingtaine de jours, et je suis persuadé que la commission va les écouter. Les recommandations découlent strictement de la commission.

M. Morin : Entendre une réponse aussi ignorante m'insulte. Il se souviendra que le ministre Runciman n'a pas hésité un instant pour exprimer son mécontentement à la suite de la fermeture d'un hôpital dans sa circonscription. Quand allez-vous intervenir, Monsieur le Ministre, afin que les Franco-Ontariens ne subissent pas l'humiliation d'assister à la fermeture définitive de l'hôpital Montfort sans que le ministre des Affaires francophones lève le petit doigt ? Quand allez-vous manifester votre désaccord ?

L'hon M. Villeneuve : Je remercie encore mon collègue. Je suis convaincu — on n'est pas obligé de répéter mais, par contre, ça vaut la peine d'être répété — que dans la région de l'Outaouais ontarien, nous avons environ 800 lits d'hôpital qui sont vides maintenant, l'équivalent de trois hôpitaux de moyenne grandeur.

1450
Je vous dis que strictement, la commission a été établie il y a un an et demi, complètement rien à faire avec la politique. Vous me demandez de politiser avec ce dont vous étiez bel et bien d'accord il y a un an et demi. Nous ne politiserons pas la commission continue à oeuvrer, et n'oublions pas que le gouvernement fédéral aura tranché au-delà de 2 \$ milliards, ce qui est environ 40 % des transferts pour les soins de santé en Ontario.

Mr Morin : On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm sure the table is advised that I will participate in the late show on Thursday evening.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Please file the appropriate papers. New question.

M. Howard Hampton (Rainy River) : J'ai une question pour le premier ministre. Hier vous avez dit aux journalistes que vous êtes fermement engagé à offrir des services en français là où la demande existe. Mais la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort menace ces services non seulement pour les patients de la région d'Ottawa mais partout en Ontario.

L'hôpital Montfort est le seul hôpital francophone d'enseignement médical en Ontario. C'est pour cela que ça représente une question d'unité nationale. En fermant l'hôpital Montfort, vous menacez la capacité de formation des médecins et infirmières francophones en Ontario, menaçant ainsi l'accès aux soins de santé pour toute la population francophone. Je vous demande donc aujourd'hui de renverser cette décision et de protéger l'hôpital Montfort.

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I want to say that appreciate the member's support for my colleague and our government in providing French-language services across the province and ensuring that we are able to do so in the future. I have made no decision, so there's nothing for me to reverse.

But I think it's important we do express our concerns to the restructuring commission to ensure that anything post-restructuring will provide at least equal or better access to services for francophones in Ontario. That certainly will be our commitment. That is what the minister is expressing. That is what I am expressing. I'd be pleased to pass on your support for that to the commissioner as well, unless you want to do it yourself.

The Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Cochrane South.

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : Monsieur le Premier Ministre, ce n'est pas acceptable. Vous avez besoin de comprendre que l'hôpital Montfort est le flambeau, c'est l'espoir, c'est là où nous, les francophones, nous retrouvons. Mais plus important, l'hôpital Montfort est responsable pour être capable de trouver un milieu pour faire l'entraînement nécessaire de nos médecins et tous ceux qui sont professionnels dans le domaine de la santé.

Dans Kirkland Lake, Timmins, Windsor et toutes les communautés où on a besoin de desservir la communauté francophone, l'hôpital Montfort joue un rôle pour faire cet entraînement. En fermant cet hôpital, qu'est-ce qui va arriver avec ces services ? Qu'est-ce qui va arriver avec l'entraînement ? On vous demande encore une fois de renverser la décision qui était faite et de démontrer par vos actions que les services en français sont importants pour la communauté ontarienne et que vous les soutenez.

Hon Mr Harris: I think you've heard me express and you've heard the minister express, and I've expressed to the Prime Minister and to Ms Copps — who congratulated us on the extensive French-language commitment in education, by the way, to francophones here in Ontario — and to others that we are committed to ensuring that not one whit of service to the francophone community in education and in training of doctors and others that have been provided will be acceptable to us after the final decision has been made. I appreciate your support of my colleague and our government, and I'll pass those concerns on to the commissioner as well.

SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr Dan Newman (Scarborough Centre): My question today is for the Minister of Education and Training. Last Friday I met with parents from Anson Park public school and John A. Leslie public school to discuss, among other things, Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act. Parents and students are concerned about what a single, united Toronto district board of education will mean to the many excellent and innovative programs that currently exist at the Scarborough Board of Education, specifically, for example, Scarborough's zero tolerance policy against violence and weapons program.

Can the minister explain to me and the parents from Anson Park public school and John A. Leslie public school who will be responsible for deciding which programs will be kept by a new, united board if and when Bill 104 passes?

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): I want to thank the member for Scarborough Centre for the question. I know this is a concern for

people around the province because we do have a lot of very different programs, some very excellent programs, offered by various boards. When the school boards are amalgamated, if we have passage of Bill 104 in its current state, it's our intention and it's the intention of the bill to make sure that the new, elected school board would have the right to take on those policies that they'd like to.

My sense of this, having talked to people who serve as trustees and to parents and educators in the province, is that this is really an opportunity to take the best policies and the best practices from a variety of different boards and put them together in a way that works best for the young people in that area, and that's what I trust will happen.

Mr Newman: Now that the minister has clarified that for the House, could he please tell my constituents in Scarborough Centre, including those parents, what steps they might be able to take to ensure that those excellent programs within the Scarborough Board of Education like zero tolerance are retained by the new, united board?

Hon Mr Snobelen: Of course there will be trustee representation on any new board that's created. I can assure the member, again from my conversations with people who are involved in both the administration and the practice of education in the province, that there is a great concern about school violence, to make sure that our schools are safe. I know all the members from Scarborough share that concern, so I believe there is absolutely no reason to be concerned about that program being dropped by a new board. In fact I think that program will be enhanced and spread into other areas where there is a real concern about the safety of children.

Again, I congratulate the Scarborough board on the zero tolerance program. I believe it will be a model for other boards as we work to have a system of education governance with less waste, less duplication and certainly fewer politicians.

HEALTH SERVICES RESTRUCTURING COMMISSION

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): My question is to our Minister of Health, asking him to improve on the response coming from the government side today about responsibility-taking. I'm this time referring to the Health Services Restructuring Commission. We know that the problems of hospitals are directly linked to the cuts that you signed, that have come off your desk. But we know as well that they're now also suffering from this Health Services Restructuring Commission you set up as a political instrument dressed up as some kind of health solution.

You have now lost the confidence of all the major health service providers. This week the Ontario Medical Association, Dr Gerry Rowland, said you're moving too fast and you should block this commission. Earlier this month the Ontario Hospital Association said your plan of restructuring was seriously flawed and must be fundamentally changed. The Ontario Nurses' Association said that patients are not being protected, that you're focusing on bricks and mortar instead.

Minister, will you please stand in your place today and take some responsibility for your commission that is closing hospitals in this province, and will you stop this commission until you have it set up on some kind of a more responsible basis?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): Since we're doing who said what today, let me read the London Free Press of this morning, which says:

"What indication has the Harris government given that it plans to renege on these firm and unequivocal election commitments?" — referring to the health commitments. "This year the province plans to spend \$17.7 billion on health, up from \$17.4 billion three years ago. That's quite an achievement, especially as the federal Liberals have slashed transfer payments to the province for health and social services by \$2.1 billion.

"What Ontario's Liberals and New Democrats could not do was muster the political courage to close entire hospitals," after they closed over 10,000 beds in the province. "As a result, the hospital sector is grossly inefficient. Currently, only about 38% of the physical space of the sprawling London and St Thomas psychiatric hospitals is in use; the rest stands empty."

1500

It goes on to commend the government and the commission for ensuring that every dollar goes to patient services and away from administration and redundant bricks and mortar.

We have a solid plan, a plan that will put health care in Ontario on a very firm footing —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Minister. Supplementary.

Mr Kennedy: Minister, the fact is and the fact has been revealed daily, you have no plan. You have no basis under which to bring things together. But what you do have is responsibility for the restructuring commission.

Yesterday your aide was quoted in the paper as saying you couldn't stop this commission. The act that created it, Bill 26, which took away powers of hospital boards, says that you can. You can "amend or revoke a direction made under this section" where you consider it to be in the public interest. All across this province are patients waiting for you to get hold of the public interest, to tell them that the guidelines that have been used by this restructuring commission are your responsibility, that those faulty benchmarks that are closing hospitals across this province, that are now causing you to have this commission meet with your Conservative caucus, that are politicizing this process, that you'll stand responsible for them.

Minister, will you stand up today and take responsibility for your commission and tell us when you'll use your power to work in the public interest, for Montfort, for the other hospitals in this province that need you to be the Minister of Health, and not give those powers away to some unelected group that isn't accountable?

Hon Mr Wilson: The honourable member has a lot of nerve. It's his party that cut \$2.1 billion from health care in Ontario. We've done everything we can as a government to increase the health care budget. It's up significantly. We spend 6% more per person in Ontario than any other jurisdiction, any other province or territory in

Canada. We're right up there with the rest of the world, and that's in spite of the uncooperative atmosphere we've had from the federal government with respect to the cash transfers to our province. The beds are closed. You closed the beds. We've got to get fewer buildings, more services, modern hospitals, new technology and the best services available for the patients of Ontario, because that's what they need and deserve.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): A question to the Premier. It's already very troubling today. We've been listening to your Minister of Municipal Affairs, and it's clear that he has not listened to the hundreds of people who have come before the committee, the hundreds of people who said they don't want amendments to Bill 103, they want Bill 103 withdrawn. It's clear he hasn't listened to all those people who have been going to meetings, meeting after meeting after meeting, in opposition to your megacity concept. It's quite clear he does not understand the message people tried to send him last night.

Your government has been cited for contempt. Your government has had to face an Ontario court judge who said you're not behaving like a responsible government or a responsive government. People want to see from your government a willingness to listen. People want to see a recognition from your government that you've got it wrong. Premier, will you withdraw Bill 103, go back to the drawing board and respect the wishes of the people who live across Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): What we've had to face is an \$11.2-billion deficit we inherited from one of the worst governments in the history of Canada, let alone just the province of Ontario. That's what we've had to face. After having faced that and consulting in a whole host of areas and bringing forward decisions that you put off, postponed, that led to this deficit, now, all of a sudden, you say you have an idea. Six years later you say you have an idea.

Let me say this: Maybe the lightbulb has gone off; maybe now you recognize the disasters. Let me also congratulate you. At least you've thought of something, which is more than the Liberals have done. They continue to be the old-style politicians, negative this. "I'm against referendums," McGuinty says, "I'm against change, I'm against all those things." So let me at least acknowledge that perhaps the lightbulb is going off and you recognize there need to be solutions.

Let me also say this: Nobody has listened more carefully and is prepared to respond —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much. Motions? No motions. Petitions?

PETITIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition which reads as follows:

"Stop Megacity Madness: Citizens Have Democratic Right to be Heard.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas 'bigger government is not better' and the Mike Harris government has no right to dictate a megacity upon the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto;

"Whereas the megacity is being imposed on 2.3 million citizens in Metro Toronto without giving people a voice in the future of their cities and neighbourhoods;

"Whereas a megacity could lead to mega property tax increases, mega user fees and mega cuts in services;

"Whereas the Tories never proposed abolishing local government in favour of bigger government during the election campaign;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To give the 2.3 million people in Metro Toronto a say in the future of their cities and stop the imposition of a megacity."

I affix my signature, as I'm in full agreement with this endorsed-by-a-referendum petition before this House today.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): I have another petition on the issue of drunk driving in support of the Margaret Marland bill.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas drinking and driving is the largest criminal cause of death and injury in Canada;

"Whereas every 45 minutes in Ontario a driver is involved in an alcohol-related crash;

"Whereas most alcohol-related accidents are caused by repeat offenders;

"Whereas lengthy licence suspensions for impaired driving have been shown to greatly reduce repeat offences;

"Whereas the victims of impaired drivers often pay with their lives while only 22% of convicted impaired drivers go to jail, and even then on average for only 21 days;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We urge the provincial government to pass legislation that will strengthen measures against impaired drivers in Ontario."

I affix my own signature thereto.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): I have a petition that reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cut to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to call on the Conservative government to stop the

cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must fund hospitals with a funding formula that reflects demographic and regional needs. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

I've attached my name to that petition as well.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): I am pleased to present a petition to the Legislature of Ontario.

"Whereas the government of Ontario has introduced Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, into the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 104 seriously undermines the job security of caring professional support staff of the educational system of Durham Region;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to stop the process of outsourcing or the privatization of essential support staff, namely, custodians, maintenance, office, clerical, technical, secretarial and educational assistant staff. They are an essential service to the Durham Board of Education and the Durham Regional Roman Catholic Separate School Board and to the students of the region."

I'm pleased to sign my name to the petition.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North): "Stop Megacity Madness: Citizens Have Democratic Right to be Heard.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas 'bigger government is not better' and the Mike Harris government has no right to dictate a megacity upon the citizens of Metro Toronto;

"Whereas the megacity is being imposed on 2.3 million citizens in Metro Toronto without giving people a voice in the future of their cities and neighbourhoods;

"Whereas a megacity could lead to mega property tax increases, mega user fees and mega cuts in services;

"Whereas the Tories never proposed abolishing local government in favour of bigger government during the election campaign;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To give the 2.3 million people in Metro Toronto a say in the future of their cities and stop the imposition of a megacity."

1510

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas drinking and driving is the largest criminal cause of death and injury in Canada; and

"Whereas every 45 minutes in Ontario a driver is involved in an alcohol-related crash; and

"Whereas most alcohol-related accidents are caused by repeat offenders; and

"Whereas lengthy licence suspensions for impaired driving have been shown to greatly reduce repeat offences; and

"Whereas the victims of impaired drivers often pay with their lives while only 22% of convicted impaired drivers go to jail, and even then only for an average of 21 days;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We urge the provincial government to pass legislation that will strengthen measures against impaired drivers in Ontario."

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): I am pleased to present this on behalf of the people from Bruce and happy that the member for Bruce is here to hear this. A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cut to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to call on the Conservative government to stop the cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must (a) vote for the Pupatello resolution; find a funding formula" —

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Community and Social Services): Oh, it's now the Pupatello resolution.

Mrs Pupatello: Okay, I did add that — "that reflects geographic and regional needs. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

This is signed by the people from Bruce county.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have a Christopherson resolution I'd like to read.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Harris government has begun a process to open the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario; and

"Whereas this act is the single most important piece of legislation for working people since it is designed to protect our lives, safety and health while at work and allow us to return home to our families in the same condition in which we left; and

"Whereas the government has made it clear that they intend to water down the act and weaken the rights of workers under the law, including the right to know, the right to participate and especially the right to refuse unsafe work; and

"Whereas this government has already watered down proper training of certified committee members;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario not to alter the Occupational Health and Safety Act or erode the rights of workers any further and ensure strict enforcement of the legislation."

On behalf of my caucus colleagues, I add my name to theirs.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): I'm very happy to present this petition which supports my private member's bill against drunk driving.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas drinking and driving is the largest criminal cause of death and injury in Canada;

"Whereas every 45 minutes in Ontario a driver is involved in an alcohol-related crash;

"Whereas most alcohol-related accidents are caused by repeat offenders;

"Whereas lengthy licence suspensions for impaired drivers have been shown to greatly reduce repeat offences;

"Whereas the victims of impaired drivers often pay with their lives while only 22% of convicted impaired drivers go to jail, and even then only for an average of 21 days;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We urge the provincial government to pass legislation that will strengthen measures against impaired drivers in Ontario."

I'm very proud to lend my support to this petition.

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-Walkerville): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, acknowledge the high quality of secondary education which has been developed in Ontario;

"We acknowledge that quality is maintained only through ongoing evaluation and improvements in the curriculum. We also believe that any improvement must be the result of long-term planning and broad-based consultation.

"Since this planning and consultation is not evident in the current reform proposal, we urge the minister to withdraw his proposal until such time as a draft is developed which is based on sound educational research and planning."

I'm pleased to affix my signature along with the thousands of others of my constituents who have signed this petition.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have petition supporting the firefighters of Ontario.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire

safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I proudly add my name to theirs.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr Toby Barrett (Norfolk): "Whereas drinking and driving is the largest criminal cause of death and injury in Canada; and

"Whereas every 45 minutes in Ontario a driver is involved in an alcohol-related crash; and

"Whereas most alcohol-related accidents are caused by repeat offenders; and

"Whereas lengthy licence suspensions for impaired driving have been shown to greatly reduce repeat offences; and

"Whereas the victims of impaired drivers often pay with their lives while only 22% of convicted impaired drivers go to jail, and even then only for an average of 21 days;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We urge the provincial government to pass legislation that will strengthen measures against impaired drivers in Ontario."

I am in agreement with this petition and hereby sign my name to it.

HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall): I have a petition to the Legislature of Ontario.

"Whereas we, the health care consumers and health care providers of Ontario, request that the Ministry of Health take steps to ensure that direct patient care is provided by adequate numbers of regulated health care workers whose skills and knowledge match the role they undertake;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows...."

The petition has been signed by 100 residents of the Cornwall riding and S-D-G & East Grenville. Another 40 people signed the letter accompanying the petition.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas it is vital that occupational health and safety services provided to workers be conducted by organizations in which workers have faith; and

"Whereas the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers have provided such services on behalf of workers for many years; and

"Whereas the centre and clinics have made a significant contribution to improvements in workplace health and safety and the reduction of injuries, illnesses and death caused by work;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to oppose any attempt to erode the struc-

ture, services or funding of the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers.

"Further, we, the undersigned, demand that education and training of Ontario workers continue in its present form through the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and that professional and technical expertise and advice continue to be provided through the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers."

I proudly add my name to theirs.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr W. Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew): I have a petition about health care in Ontario and it reads as follows:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cuts to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to call on the Progressive Conservative government to stop the cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

I submit this petition on behalf of my constituents with the understanding that the Mike Harris government is restructuring to improve the system by maximizing the amount of dollars that go towards direct care.

1520

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This is a petition in response to Bill 84.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the firefighters of Sudbury and Ontario are very concerned about Bill 84; and

"Whereas we feel Bill 84 is unfair; and

"Whereas we feel Bill 84 is discriminatory; and

"Whereas we feel Bill 84 endangers the wellbeing of the people of Ontario; and

"Whereas we feel Bill 84 requires extensive changes; and

"Whereas we feel Bill 84 needs broad provincial public hearings before implementation; and

"Whereas speed, experience and teamwork save lives; and

"Whereas we don't want to get burned by Bill 84;

"We therefore petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to listen when we say firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

4588 BATHURST ACT, 1997

Ms Bassett moved first reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr74, An Act respecting 4588 Bathurst.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

750 SPADINA AVENUE ASSOCIATION ACT, 1997

Ms Bassett moved first reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr75, An Act respecting 750 Spadina Avenue Association.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

OPPOSITION DAY

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I move opposition day motion number 3:

Whereas the Harris government is wiping out the existing municipalities of Toronto, the city of York, East York, North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke and replacing them with one enormous megacity of 2.3 million people;

Whereas Mike Harris and his party platform made no mention of amalgamating the six municipalities composing Metropolitan Toronto prior to the 1995 provincial election and were not elected on that basis;

Whereas the Harris government has no mandate from the people to amalgamate Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity;

Whereas, as recently as 1994, Mike Harris said: "There is no cost for a municipality to retain its name and identity. Why destroy our roots and pride? I disagree with restructuring because it believes that bigger is better. Services always cost more in larger communities";

Whereas the Harris government is forcing the people of Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity to hide the \$531 million in increased taxes for Metro residents that will be caused by the Harris government's dumping of provincial costs on to the municipalities of Ontario;

Whereas the ill-conceived plan to create this megacity is based on a three-week KPMG study carried out behind closed doors and without consultation;

Whereas the KPMG study contradicts the recommendations of every other study carried out on greater Toronto area restructuring over the last 40 years;

Whereas even the author of the KPMG study admitted that "there has been no amalgamation of which I am aware in the current fiscal environment that would demonstrate the certainty of savings";

Whereas the Harris government has stated that it plans to drive the legislation creating the megacity through the Legislature by April, without leaving adequate time for study or consultation;

Whereas the Harris government's plans to force the people of Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity will

cause property taxes to soar, will lead to more cuts in services and will make government even more remote from the people that it is supposed to serve;

Whereas studies have shown that once a city grows to over one million people, economies of scale in municipal operations disappear and per capita costs for basic services go up;

Whereas Mike Harris and Al Leach have failed to provide the people of Ontario with any numbers to support their contention that amalgamation will lead to cost savings;

Whereas the Harris government's own study anticipates transition costs of \$150 million to \$220 million following amalgamation;

Whereas unprecedented grass-roots opposition to the megacity plan has sprung up all over Metropolitan Toronto;

Whereas thousands of Metro residents have spontaneously and vocally expressed their opposition to the megacity plan;

Whereas the public hearings on Bill 103 conducted by the Harris government have failed to reveal any widespread support for this legislation and instead have revealed deep and consistent concern about this plan among citizens of all political stripes and affiliations;

Whereas the Harris government has refused to conduct its own referendum on the issue of amalgamation;

Whereas the Mike Harris government has stated that it plans to proceed with its plan to force the citizens of Metro Toronto into a megacity regardless of their wishes;

Whereas the Harris government is consistently ignoring the voice of the people of Metropolitan Toronto by continuing to plow ahead with its megacity plan and is acting undemocratically by forcing this massive change down the throats of the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto without proper consultation or a mandate from the people;

Therefore this House calls upon the provincial government to reverse its decision to amalgamate Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity, to withdraw Bill 103 and to proceed to consult with the people and the governments of Metropolitan Toronto, to develop a plan to restructure the greater Toronto area for better coordination of services and strengthened local government and to make this a better place for all citizens to live.

That's the motion. Thank you.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Opposition day number 3 moved by Mr Colle:

Whereas the Harris government is wiping out the existing municipalities of Toronto, the city of York, East York —

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): Dispense.

The Speaker: No, I think I'll go through it.

— North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke and replacing them with one enormous megacity of 2.3 million people;

Whereas Mike Harris and his party platform made no mention of amalgamating the six municipalities composing Metropolitan Toronto prior to the 1995 provincial election and were not elected on that basis;

Whereas the Harris government has no mandate from the people to amalgamate Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity;

Whereas, as recently as 1994, Mike Harris said: "There is no cost for a municipality to retain its name and identity. Why destroy our roots and pride? I disagree with restructuring because it believes that bigger is better. Services always cost more in larger communities";

Whereas the Harris government is forcing the people of Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity to hide the \$531 million in increased taxes for Metro residents that will be caused by the Harris government's dumping of provincial costs on to the municipalities of Ontario;

Whereas the ill-conceived plan to create this megacity is based on a three-week KPMG study carried out behind closed doors and without consultation;

Whereas the KPMG study contradicts the recommendations of every other study carried out on greater Toronto area restructuring over the last 40 years;

Whereas even the author of the KPMG study admitted that "there has been no amalgamation of which I am aware in the current fiscal environment that would demonstrate the certainty of savings";

Whereas the Harris government has stated that it plans to drive the legislation creating the megacity through the Legislature by April, without leaving adequate time for study or consultation;

Whereas the Harris government's plans to force the people of Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity will cause property taxes to soar, will lead to more cuts in services and will make government even more remote from the people that it is supposed to serve;

Whereas studies have shown that once a city grows to over one million people, economies of scale in municipal operations disappear and per capita costs for basic services go up;

Whereas Mike Harris and Al Leach have failed to provide the people of Ontario with any numbers to support their contention that amalgamation will lead to cost savings;

Whereas the Harris government's own study anticipates transition costs of \$150 million to \$220 million following amalgamation;

Whereas unprecedented grass-roots opposition to the megacity plan has sprung up all over Metropolitan Toronto;

Whereas thousands of Metro residents have spontaneously and vocally expressed their opposition to the megacity plan;

Whereas the public hearings on Bill 103 conducted by the Harris government have failed to reveal any widespread support for this legislation and instead have revealed deep and consistent concern about this plan among citizens of all political stripes and affiliations;

Whereas the Harris government has refused to conduct its own referendum on the issue of amalgamation;

Whereas the Mike Harris government has stated that it plans to proceed with its plan to force the citizens of Metro Toronto into a megacity regardless of their wishes;

Whereas the Harris government is consistently ignoring the voice of the people of Metropolitan Toronto by continuing to plow ahead with its megacity plan and is acting undemocratically by forcing this massive change down the throats of the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto without proper consultation or a mandate from the people;

Therefore this House calls upon the provincial government to reverse its decision to amalgamate Metropolitan Toronto into a megacity, to withdraw Bill 103 and to proceed to consult with the people and the governments of Metropolitan Toronto, to develop a plan to restructure the greater Toronto area for better coordination of services and strengthened local government and to make this a better place for all citizens to live.

1530

Mr Miclash: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Might I ask for unanimous consent to have my leader go first, please?

The Speaker: The member for Kenora is seeking unanimous consent to allow the leader of the official opposition to lead off debate. Agreed? Leader of the official opposition.

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): I'm looking forward to this opportunity to participate in what I believe to be a very important debate for this House.

Yesterday the people of Metropolitan Toronto spoke loudly and very clearly. They sent Mike Harris and the Ontario government an unmistakable message. They said, "We do not want your megacity." They said, "We do not want you imposing change on us." Finally, they said, "If you continue to try and destroy the communities that we've worked so hard to build, we will fight you every single step of the way."

This isn't the first time the government has been given this message. It's the same message that has been delivered every day at the public hearings by citizen after citizen, group after group, and expert after expert. It's the same message that was delivered by thousands of people marching down Yonge Street, and it's the same message that is delivered every night of the week in every corner of Metro Toronto by groups numbering from 50 to 1,500. I say again, the message has been delivered loudly, clearly and unmistakably.

The question now is: Will this government listen? There are just a few days before the end of public hearings on Bill 103, the City of Toronto Act, a bill which might more appropriately be called Megacity, Whether You Like It or Not.

The government argues that this issue is complex, too complex, it says, for the people to decide. But it really all boils down to two simple issues: (1) Is the megacity the right vision for one of the greatest urban centres in the world? and (2) Does this government really believe in democracy? Does it believe in the right of people to decide on the type of community they want to live in?

Let me first speak about the megacity. I want to say up front that I do not believe a megacity is the right vision for Metro Toronto. I believe in strong local governments. I believe in local government because that is the level of government that is closest to the people and that is the level of government to which people can get closest.

When I talk to people in the borough of East York or the city of York, they tell me that one of the great things they love about their communities is that when they have a problem they can call the mayor's office and someone will get back to them the very same day. That won't happen in a megacity of 2.3 million people. When I talk

to people from North York they tell me that one of the things that makes their community special is that their garbage gets picked up twice a week and that they have the best snow clearing in all of Metropolitan Toronto. That too will disappear in a megacity.

I'll say again that I'm a very strong advocate of local government, but that doesn't mean I support the status quo. Far from it. By all means let's change towards an integrated transit system, but not just in Metro Toronto; we need it across the greater Toronto area. Let's change towards integrated land use planning, but not just in Metro — across the GTA. Let's change towards an integrated economic strategy that will attract more investment and jobs, but not just in Metro — right across the GTA. Let's recognize that all of this has to be anchored to something in order to work, and that something is strong local government.

There's nothing particularly new or unique about this vision of strong local governments and better co-ordination across the GTA. That's the vision that was put forward by the Anne Golden commission — in my view, the right vision for Metropolitan Toronto.

It's also a vision that coincidentally used to be shared by Mike Harris, now Premier. Mike Harris used to be the great defender of local government. In fact, I remember when Mike Harris was campaigning in the town of Fergus and someone asked him about amalgamation, and he said: "Why destroy our roots and pride? I disagree with restructuring, because it believes that bigger is better. Services always cost more in larger communities."

He was right. Mike Harris was right, but that was then and this is now. Leader of the Opposition Mike Harris was a great defender of local government; Premier Mike Harris sings a completely different tune.

I also remember when Mike Harris went to Scarborough and told them that their fiscal efficiency was a model that should be followed by other levels of government. I hope you heard that correctly, Mr Speaker. He said "followed by other levels of government," not "swallowed by other levels of government." He was right again; in fact, he was absolutely right. But that was then and this is now. Opposition Leader Mike Harris understood the efficiencies then of local government; Premier Mike Harris sings another tune altogether.

Mike Harris used to sing another tune too, the tune of the Taxfighter, but the best experts on city planning tell us a megacity will increase our taxes. This courtesy of the Taxfighter. If you ask me, the Taxfighter is taking a dive. But that's not just my opinion. Let me read into the record what Paul Pagnuelo, the president of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, has to say. He says: "A single Metro Toronto government will be more costly, leading to higher taxes. It will result in lower service quality and make the Metro area less competitive and will stifle innovation." That from a traditional ally of the Harris government.

I also want to read into the record what Joyce Trimmer had to say. The members opposite will be very familiar with the name of Joyce Trimmer. She was the person Mike Harris appointed before the election as his principal adviser on matters related to the GTA. Here is what Mrs Trimmer had to say about Mike's megacity: "The public

simply doesn't know what it's in for. They might think less government is a good idea, but they've been sold a bill of goods if they believe all the propaganda that this will save money."

Now I'd like to say a word about Bill 103 and democracy. Democracy is in some ways a simple concept, although many have fought and many have died for it over the years. Democracy is rarely convenient and tidy. Instead, it's a slow and messy miracle. At its heart, it means that people must have a say in how they are governed. They must have a say on the future of their communities. Democracy clearly imposes a responsibility on people. It's their responsibility to understand the choices before them, and it's their responsibility to choose wisely.

Democracy imposes responsibility on those who govern. Democracy gives the people a voice, but it also compels those who govern to listen to that voice. Democracy isn't just something that takes place once every four years. Democracy is what is supposed to happen in a free society each and every day. Democracy is what took place yesterday across Metro. People were asked if they wanted to be a part of a megacity, and they said no. They said no loudly. They said no overwhelmingly. They said no on every block in every neighbourhood in every city and borough right across Metropolitan Toronto.

Mike Harris and Al Leach view the referenda results as an inconvenience, and with one wave of their hands they dismiss the results of all the referenda across Metro. They say that the question asked was not the kind of scientific question that Environics or Angus Reid would ask. What then of the pollsters themselves? Where have they weighed in when it came to this issue?

Environics released the results of an extensive poll just last week, and the poll showed that there was overwhelming opposition to the megacity right across the GTA. The megacity was rejected by every single demographic group: men, women, rich and poor, old and young. Angus Reid just released a poll showing nearly 60% of people siding with the No side. There was one further poll released this past weekend by pollster Allan Gregg. His poll showed that nearly two thirds of people in Metro want the provincial government to respect the results of the referenda. Even people who voted yes believe the government should listen to the results of the referenda. But Mike Harris and Al Leach apparently still intend to bow their necks and bull ahead.

540

I and my caucus are still interested in what the people have to say. A few weeks ago we began a process that this government would never have thought to undertake. We started going out and asking people across this province how the dumping of \$1 billion in new costs will affect their lives and the quality of their communities. Tomorrow I'll be sharing with you the results of this consultation, but I want to quote today from one of our representatives, Dr Charles Pascal. Dr Pascal is now executive director of the Atkinson foundation, but I believe his name is well-known and well-respected by all members of this Legislature as the former Deputy Minister of Community and Social Services and the former Deputy Minister of Education and Training.

Dr Pascal came to our hearings because he is deeply disturbed by what this government is doing to the quality of life in our communities. Here's how he wrapped up his presentation: "Good policy administered badly is harmful enough, but bad policy administered quickly can be devastating." That is exactly what this government is doing with its megacity and mega-dumping. It's ramming through bad policy quickly.

I want to tell you, though, that in spite of all of this I have hope. I still have hope because the megacity is not yet a done deal. So I urge everyone here from all three parties to support the resolution that is now before us, and if the government does not have the common sense to immediately withdraw Bill 103, I urge them to vote against this bill when it reappears before this Legislature in April for final reading. I do this because I do not see the future of one of the great metropolitan areas of the world, a community that took generations to build but could be destroyed by one act of folly by one government, I do not see the future of Metro Toronto as a partisan issue.

A few weeks ago, when I joined the thousands of people marching down Yonge Street, the thing that struck me most was how diverse a group it was. There were Liberals against the megacity, New Democrats against the megacity and, yes, even Conservatives against the megacity. I know there are members opposite who are opposed to the megacity and I'm urging them, I'm calling upon them to follow their consciences. I appeal to them directly. You've seen how your constituents voted in the referenda in your communities. You've seen the No signs on the houses and lawns in your neighbourhoods. You've been to neighbourhood meetings and you've heard the anger and emotion that this bill has sparked. I urge all the members opposite, but especially those from Metro Toronto, to vote with your constituents and against this bad policy, against the megacity bill.

There's a fine line between leadership and being out of touch and I suggest to the members opposite that to ignore the clear and unequivocal results of the referenda would not be to show leadership; it would be to ignore the will of those you represent.

Everyone in this Legislature ought to support this resolution. It's a win-win proposition. We, as legislators, can win because we will have listened to the people and we will have made the right choice, and the people of Metro will win because they will be given the opportunity to continue growing and changing in a way that works best for them.

Let's all vote our conscience today. Let's bring home a win for the people of Metro Toronto and let's bring home a win for democracy.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I'm glad to rise today and to lead off debate on this resolution presented by the Liberal Party and to indicate on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus our support for this resolution.

It's clear that yesterday the voters and the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto sent Mike Harris a very clear message. In the words of one of the three Toronto dailies that has been most adamant in its support for the megacity, which had this morning on its masthead, "It's Mega No to Megacity," it was clearly a resounding rejection of

the megacity proposal that Al Leach and Mike Harris have been so persistent in insisting on.

It's clearly a rejection of the other pieces that are so linked to what they are proposing to do: the downloading on to the property tax base of services that don't belong there and the equally destructive approach they are taking to our school boards and our education system with Bill 104.

I've heard certainly on more than one occasion the Premier and other ministers and other members of the government say, "You know, when people were voting yesterday, they weren't just voting on the megacity bill," as if to say that all of a sudden it made the vote more acceptable to them.

I've been following and have been part of the committee process as we've been discussing Bill 103 in particular, and it's true that people have made very clearly the connection between that bill and the downloading and the destructive approach of this government with respect to education. They haven't had to search very far to make that connection because in fact the government has made that connection for us and for the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto and indeed of the province with respect to the downloading and the education changes.

When Mike Harris says, "People were actually voting on other issues," then perhaps he should go a little bit further than that and acknowledge that in voting no, as people did so overwhelmingly yesterday in Metropolitan Toronto, just perhaps they were also voting no on that whole package he put together in front of people. It should leave him, as the Premier of this province, with something to think about; it should leave him and all members in this Legislature with something to reflect upon.

Yesterday, despite all the efforts this government has made, the money that's been spent, the millions of dollars in advertising in trying to get people to sort of feel good and forget about the individual issues that are being dealt with, in trying to pretend that everything is fine, in the persistence of ministers and members of this government to say no to call after call from citizens, from groups, from a variety of individuals, calling the ministers and the members of this government to come to their senses, despite that persistence, despite the fact that the Speaker of this House found a *prima facie* case of contempt against the Minister of Municipal Affairs, despite the fact that a judge found their actions in appointing the trustees to be illegal, despite all those things, the government was still persisting and today is still persisting that what it is doing with the megacity bill is appropriate, but they cannot in any way ignore the strength of the rejection that was there yesterday, the clarity, the vigour of that rejection, the clear message residents in Metropolitan Toronto sent Mike Harris, and Al Leach in particular, yesterday.

What's important in supporting this resolution and this motion is for all members, particularly government members, to come to grips with that reality, the reality being that you lost, the reality being that the people have spoken against you, the reality being that the people understand now more than ever your agenda and don't like it, don't approve of it and told you so in clear, unequivocal terms.

1550

The question now turns to what should be done about it. What is the appropriate response to such a clear objection, such a clear demonstration of the people's will against the actions of the Mike Harris government?

I see what happened yesterday as being far more significant than just the strong vote of no to the megacity bill, as incredibly important and significant as that is. I see it as being even more important in the sense that the people, in this case the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto, have refound their voice.

There has been a sense throughout the province, certainly including here in Metropolitan Toronto, since this government came to office, in the last 20 months of devastation that they have sown right across the province, that there was perhaps no way to get to them, that there was no way to get them to understand the devastation they were causing, that there was no way to get them to move from the arrogant positions they were continuing to take, that there was no way to get them to understand that their actions both in process and in substance continued to show incredible contempt for the parliamentary process, and more importantly, for the people of this province.

What happened yesterday was that people finally realized they had a way to tell the government of the day, to tell Mike Harris that they don't approve of what he's doing, that they object strongly to what he's doing. That they did, so clearly, so strongly, so forcefully yesterday in the large number of people who voted, generally larger than happens in municipal elections, and then even more incredibly with the large, resounding voice which ranges from 73% to 80%, 81%, 81.5% of people saying no, an unequivocal, very clear objection to what Mike Harris is doing.

This should give the government real concern because one of the things that I think people were saying to them yesterday was, "You cannot continue to govern in a way that positions the people as the enemy." That has been the attitude we have seen time after time from this government, that somehow the people out there were the problem and that it knew best, as a government, what should be done regardless of what the people felt should be done, that they were the ones who knew and know what the answers are to the incredibly real problems that exist.

Once again, yesterday, with the referendum results, the people of Metropolitan Toronto, at least, said: "No, we do understand what's going on. We don't believe our government should see us, the people, as the enemy. We do believe in the notions of peace, order and good government." They sent a very real warning to Mike Harris. The test of whether they've really listened, whether they've really heard what was said yesterday will come in the days that follow.

As I looked and listened to the Premier and the minister deal with questions today, I'm one who still wants to give them a little bit of room. I still find, I have to tell you, the attitude particularly of the Minister of Municipal Affairs offensive as he continues to insult the process and the people. But even in his statement he read out today there seemed to be some indications of the door

sort of being left open just a tiny bit to some changes, not the kind of small cosmetic changes that they inevitably will bring forward in terms of amendments to Bill 103, but I hope the door left even slightly open to what really has to happen, which is a withdrawal of Bill 103, a withdrawal of Bill 104, a halt to the downloading and a real discussion beginning.

We today, taking as we do the results of all that's gone on in the last number of weeks and particularly the results of yesterday, have come forward with what we believe is a useful, constructive proposal. We've called it A Greater Toronto Area for the 21st Century, a proposal for that, and we have put it forward sincerely and truly in a constructive way, as a way to try to say to the government: "There's a dilemma. You've painted yourselves into a corner. We know you have to get out of it. We know you have to find a way to get out of that morass and we want to try to be helpful, because at the end of the day, the issues that we are dealing with are, quite frankly, more important than the Conservative government and the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party."

What we've suggested is that the first step that has to take place is that those two bills, in particular Bill 103 and Bill 104, be withdrawn. Then we've said very clearly that we are not here to defend the status quo. We are not here to say, "Don't do anything." I think there's a substantive difference in what we've suggested to what some others perhaps have said, because we are not saying, "Don't do anything."

It seems to me that if I've heard correctly what citizens have said out there, they too agree that change needs to happen. While there have been a few that have said, "The status quo is just fine by us," large numbers of people who have come in front of the committee on Bill 103 have said, "Yes, we agree there needs to be change, but not this way."

We have put this proposal based on three very important principles, the first being that change is needed, but that change needs to be done so as to ensure effective local government that is responsive to the people and to our communities.

The second principle we believe in very strongly is that the issue that has to be addressed here is not just boundaries within Metropolitan Toronto and the amalgamation within Metropolitan Toronto, but that the GTA as a region is the issue that has to be addressed. What has come forward are solutions to how we provide for effective delivery of services like transportation, planning, dealing with urban sprawl, dealing with economic development for what is now the city region, because that's no longer something that's contained to either Metropolitan Toronto or to any of the other individual municipalities or regional municipalities within the greater Toronto area.

In fact, the economic entity today is the greater Toronto area. What we are saying is that is the first problem that has to be addressed and, lo and behold, that has so been what many people have said and what the last two major studies on this issue have also indicated, namely, Mr Crombie and Ms Golden's work. We are saying that's the second issue that has to be addressed.

Third, we are saying, let's be clear that whatever changes we make are not changes that are going to be made for another year or two years. The impact of those changes and the consequences of those changes are going to be around for at least the next 30 to 50 years, so we have to get it right. We have to ensure even more so, for that reason, that the citizens of the region are very much involved in that process, because we are doing nothing short in this process of in effect developing the new constitutional framework, if you will, for how to govern the city region and how to provide effective delivery of services both at the regional level and at the local level, as I say, for the next 30 to 50 years.

That's something we should not take lightly and it's not something you resolve by saying, "Well, we have to do something. It's time to do something, and even if what we're going to do is going to devastate things, we're just going to do it. We're going to steamroll ahead." You do that by taking the time and doing it properly.

But we also agree that you don't do that by prolonging study into the next half decade, because we believe there is both an appetite and an understanding about the need for change to come about. That is why we have also suggested that what we need then in terms of the process is for two important things to happen.

One is a citizens' assembly to be established that would be given the task to consult with people broadly, a group that would be representative of people from various walks of life, including politicians but certainly and most clearly including citizens right across the region. It would be given the task to consult more broadly with the wider citizenry and would be given the task of beginning with the studies that have been done, not recreating the wheel but beginning with the studies that have been done, and particularly the Golden study as a good starting point, to come up with effective recommendations about how you deal with eventually replacing the five regional governments that we have now with one regional government structure that would take a look at the region that is today and that will be there for the future, which is the greater Toronto area; and secondly, looking at the lower level of government, looking at the local government and a way to strengthen that relationship and, within that, at what possible amalgamations could take place, not just within Metropolitan Toronto but indeed in the rest of the GTA.

1600

The second important point that we are making to show that we believe in very clearly and we support very much the notion that change has to happen, that we're not simply advocating just endless studies, is to say let's get real. Let's show people that we are real about making this change. It can't be done with the present time lines but it can be done if the government is prepared to delay the next municipal elections as they affect the greater Toronto area for a year. That would give us the time we would need to ensure over the next number of months, beginning in April with the establishment of the citizens' assembly, that we would use the period between May and September, into the fall, to do the serious consultation and discussion. We would be able to bring back in the late fall proposals to the Legislative

Assembly that could be turned into legislation and that would still then give time for those to be implemented in time for elections to be held within the GTA in November 1998.

So one year's delay in the municipal elections, a real process of involving people and an understanding that with those two things will come real change; not change that simply plays around with a few politicians here and there, but change that really looks at the problems that have to be addressed.

I would just say in conclusion, we have put forward this proposal in a sincere effort to be helpful, and if the government treats it with the seriousness with which we have put it forward, we will give our full cooperation to ensuring that the process works. Because what we are dealing with here is a very significant issue, I call upon all members to understand the significance of what we are dealing with today. You ignore what happened yesterday at your own peril, but worse than that — because people can deal with you at the next election and get rid of you, and you've guaranteed your defeat if you don't hear what people have said — I'm more worried about the devastation that will have been caused in the meantime.

So I say to the Premier, I say to the minister, I say to government members, particularly those in the greater Toronto area and those more particularly inside Metropolitan Toronto, please listen to what people said to you yesterday. If you're not quite ready to go the route that you need to go, if you're not quite ready to make the move today, then take a walk, with all due respect to my colleagues opposite. Don't make things worse by rejecting this motion today that calls at least for one part of what we have been saying we need.

I ask members of the government in particular to pay strong attention to the message that was given yesterday by the electorate here in Metropolitan Toronto and to understand that people are ready for change. We can make that change happen in a structured, useful way that involves people, or you can continue your destructive process and pay the price later on, but unfortunately you will have caused great damage in the meantime. I call sincerely on the government members in particular to heed that message and to work with us to find a solution to the problem that's now facing us.

Mr John L. Parker (York East): I'm pleased to have a chance to rise in this House and address this matter for the first time, in my case, since the matter first arose. I have spoken publicly on many occasions in public, in town halls, in various forums, and I've met with many people in my riding, in my constituency office and around the riding, and have discussed the matter at some length. I intend to continue to do so, but this is the first chance I've had to rise in this House and speak on the subject of Bill 103 and the government's initiatives in this whole area. I intend to touch also on last night's results of the recent referendum. I think it's fair we do touch on that.

I think one of the most helpful comments that's been made to date in this entire discussion, in public and before our legislative committee that is assessing Bill 103, was made by Councillor Gordon Chong of Metro

Toronto, who said: "Get a grip. I think there has been more hysteria, more misunderstanding and more confusion surrounding Bill 103 and the government's motives, intentions and plans in respect of Metro restructuring than on just about any other issue I can think of since I arrived here."

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): Denial.

Mr Parker: My friend from Lake Nipigon says I'm guilty of a case of denial. Well, I'm going to suggest that perhaps he's denying the degree of confusion and consternation that has arisen over this whole matter and a number of issues that have been rolled into consideration of Bill 103.

The mere term "megacity" is itself a highly charged word, charged with tremendous connotations of some huge monster that's going to be impossible to grapple with, impossible for people to deal with, impossible for people to understand, something too big for people to cope with. The mere use of that word, and our friends opposite use it at every opportunity, creates an impression that is calculated to intimidate people and make them fear the entity that's being discussed.

We're talking about a municipal area that already has about 2.3 million people in it. The people are already here. What we're talking about is how we govern that municipal area. We're not talking about bringing more people in. We're not talking about expanding the boundaries. We're talking about facing up to the reality that in Metro Toronto we have an integrated region of 2.3 million people. We're asking the question of how best to administer that region, how best to provide government for those people and how best for those people to participate in the important decisions that must be made to administer a region of that size.

Let's take Gordon Chong's admonition and step back and try to put this whole question into some degree of perspective. What we now call Metro Toronto has evolved over many years and has grown over many years, and there have been many amalgamations over the years this area has been settled.

From the late 19th century until halfway through this century, the city of Toronto grew by amalgamation at the rate of about one amalgamation every two years. The population has been expanding, the city has been growing, and the surrounding communities have been growing, and there have been consolidations and amalgamations all the way along.

By the early 1950s it was clear we now had a region that was something greater than the sum of its parts and that it was time to address that. That's what gave rise to the Metropolitan Toronto government in 1954. The Metropolitan Toronto government was established as a means of coordinating services across the region, recognizing that it wasn't just a matter of the city of Toronto, the township of North York, the township of Etobicoke and so on, that there were certain issues that spanned the entire region and it was time we had a structure to recognize that. Metro was put in place to do that.

1610

Metro was at first indirectly elected. It was in a sense a creature of the component municipalities, and there were 13 of them at the time, 13 separate, distinct municipalities within Metro when Metro was first established.

We know what's happened since then. In the early 1960s, three of the component municipalities — Long Branch, Mimico, New Toronto — recognized that it didn't make sense for them to be on their own any more, that it made sense for further consolidation to take place.

I'm pleased to see my friend from St Catharines has just rolled in. I didn't think we would get through an afternoon without him. Perhaps he'll favour us with a few comments later on. I don't know. It would be rare if he didn't.

In the early 1960s some of the municipalities voluntarily recognized that it made no sense for them to carry on as independent municipalities and that it was time to take a further step and amalgamate further.

Before that was done, the provincial government commissioned Carl Goldenberg to look generally into that question of what further amalgamations made sense at that time. That gave rise to the amalgamations that were put in place in 1967 and we were reduced to the current six municipalities.

Some recommended it should have gone to four at the time. I think that's what Mr Goldenberg recommended. Politics being what they are, and political pressures being what they are, the provincial government at the time backed off from a four-city model and went with a six-municipality model, and we had a number of townships and one city. Those townships were later — I guess at that time they were given the name "boroughs" and later on most of them became cities, although East York, where I live, retained the title of "borough."

Nobody knows, by the way, what a borough is. Nobody knows the difference between a borough and a city, but it's a moniker that the community of East York has held on to and they wave it with some pride. It's one of the things East Yorkers are kind of attached to. They like the label of being Canada's only borough. I understand that. It's nice to have that sense of distinctiveness. What it means in reality frankly is nothing, but it's one of those things people like to cling to.

Metro has grown since that time and the role of the Metropolitan government has increased since that time. Increasingly, the Metropolitan Toronto level of government has taken over responsibility for spending more and more of our tax dollars within Metro Toronto. They tax more than our local municipalities do and they spend considerably more than our local governments do. I say they spend considerably more because they have sources of revenue other than merely property taxes. But even if you only look at their property taxes, you find that the Metro level taxes more than our local municipalities tax. Increasingly, more and more decision-making power has been vested at the Metro level, and progressively less is in the hands of the local municipalities.

At the same time, the kind of questions the local municipalities within Metro have to deal with has also changed. When Metro was first established in the early 1950s, we had a solid city core, Toronto, surrounded by pretty much vacant pasture land in the suburban areas, in the townships. I remember that. I remember that when you went north of the city limits it was farm land. When you went into North York by any distance at all you were into Windfields Farms and you were into clear, rural farm

land that was being administered — it looked the same on the ground in the late 1950s and early 1960s as it had for decades, but through the 1960s and the 1970s and into the 1980s that land in North York, Etobicoke, Scarborough and elsewhere has been pretty much fully subdivided and developed.

The subdivision and development phenomenon through that period was a very important matter on the agendas of the local governments. The local governments had to administer that. They had to make the decisions. They had to pass the bylaws. They had to monitor the development of those rural lands. It's fully developed now.

That job of the local governments has now been done. From time to time a building is bulldozed and a new building goes up, and the local governments have to make some decisions around that. From time to time a new piece of land becomes available for someone to do something with. It's been a long time since that's happened in my municipality of East York, although there's one piece of land that has been sitting there for some time and it looks as though there might be something happening with it soon. I'm talking about the Bayview ghost lands. East York has been pretty much developed for some time now, although the Bayview ghost lands have been sitting there waiting for the go-ahead to proceed with something, and it looks as though we now have a state where the go-ahead may be given for a subdivision to go in there. It's been a long time since a new subdivision went in anywhere in Metro Toronto. There are subdivisions going in around Toronto, but within Metro it's pretty much a thing of the past.

There's less and less of that sort of work for local municipalities to do but we have major issues at the Metropolitan level: subways, expressways, water conservation, water treatment, water distribution, garbage disposal — these are all Metro responsibilities — recycling, and we're recycling more and more these days, more than ever, and I hope we continue to recycle even more in the future. These are matters the Metropolitan level of government administers. That's why the Metropolitan level taxes more than our local governments do.

Metro also has responsibility for other social services. They spend some of our local tax money on that and they get some from the provincial level for that. Again that adds to the workload of the Metro level.

But we've seen a migration of the overall total degree of responsibility for municipal government in Toronto. We've seen that evolve and transfer from the local level to the Metro level. Remember that through this period, Metro was indirectly elected. It twigged in the minds of some people that there was a lack of accountability at the Metro level and it was time to do something about that, and that's been on the minds of people for some time. Mr Peterson, when he was Premier, turned his mind to that issue and he came up with a solution that he thought might help and he implemented the change that took Metro from indirect election to direct election. That was a career maker for Mr Colle, of course, but in those days Mr Colle was in favour of total amalgamation. He sang that from the rooftops and ran for election in Metro on the basis of total amalgamation of all of the Metro area.

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): You'd never know that today.

Mr Parker: You'd never know it today, but that was his platform in his early Metro career.

It has continued to be a concern to people, however, that even with direct election to Metro we still don't have the degree of accountability at the Metro level we need, given the amount of decision-making power that rests at that level. There's a frustration that has arisen as a result of that and it has manifested itself in various ways. One particularly clear-cut way in which that frustration was manifested took the form of a referendum, 1991, when the city of Toronto put a referendum question on the ballot. I'm paraphrasing now, but the question was basically, "Do you approve of doing away with the Metro level of government and proceeding with a single-tier system of government for Toronto?" That referendum question was put on the ballot for the voters of the city of Toronto in 1991, and that referendum question received a resounding answer of yes. The people of Toronto voted, frankly, to do away with the Metro level of government and to proceed with a single tier.

You might wonder what the response of the provincial government of the day was to that referendum. The provincial government of the day was Mr Rae's government. The provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs was Mr Philip. Mr Philip was asked for his response to the referendum result, and it was a very simple response, very direct, very unequivocal. His response was, "So what?" He didn't care. He wasn't going to be bound by a referendum carried out in the city of Toronto. It wasn't going to change his mind. It wasn't going to affect his decisions. It wasn't going to tell him what to do. He was the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He was going to make the decisions as to what happened.

As we say, as I've heard very often around this House from the other side in particular, that was then, this is now. In those days our NDP government didn't listen to referendum results. They rejected them out of hand. The response was, "So what?"

1620

Mr Pouliot: Are you going to drink that water or not? You're making me nervous.

Mr Parker: My friend from Lake Nipigon would like a glass of water. If the pages are available, they might bring him one. I'm glad my friend from Lake Nipigon is so entertained.

The NDP government did a rational thing as a result of or in the aftermath of the 1991 referendum. They honoured political tradition. They honoured a long-standing political tradition in this House and in Ottawa and throughout the Commonwealth. They honoured the tradition that when you are faced with a difficult question, when you are faced with a tough challenge, when you are faced with a question, a decision that is going to be controversial, you punt. You name a royal commission and you kick it over to another term.

That's what the Bob Rae government did with the whole issue of governing Metro Toronto. You may recall that MVA, market value assessment, arose during the course of their mandate. Those with particularly well-tuned memories may recall that once upon a time there was a little bit of discussion in the Metro area on the subject of market value assessment. Didn't the previous

government make a decision on the question of MVA? Sure, they made a decision on the question of MVA. They punted that one too. They decided that the only way out of this was to find someone to bail them out of an impossible situation.

"Whenever you can duck a difficult decision, duck it." That's the tradition that has been honoured in this House until now and that was the tradition that was honoured by the previous government. They brought in the Golden commission and they said: "Save us. We don't want to have to make any decisions on what to do about Metro Toronto governance. We don't want to have to decide what to do about assessment reform." Assessment reform has been kicking around as an issue for over 20 years. That's why the assessment system was taken out of the municipal governments and brought into the provincial government in the early 1970s, so that the provincial government could do something about it. Successive provincial governments have dodged the bullet.

Anne Golden and her commission was asked to look into the matter and come forward with some proposals. To their credit, the previous government recognized another question that needed to be addressed.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): — voted for the party line, did they understand the question? Do you understand the question?

Mr Parker: That's okay. I can yell loud enough to be heard over all the chattering from opposite, but maybe if you calm down I won't have to yell so loud.

Ms Martel: You don't like what the people had to say to you last night. It was no to you and no to your agenda. That's the message you should get.

Mr Parker: I'll just carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Order. I'd ask the House to come to order. Each of the parties gets a chance to debate. Each of the parties gets a chance to listen. I would ask the member for York East to proceed.

Mr Parker: For a group of people who criticize others for not listening, I find it interesting that I don't detect anyone very much listening over there right now. But that's okay. I'm not counting on them to listen, and if they do listen, I'm not counting on them to understand.

But if you listen, you'll hear a compliment because you'll hear me acknowledge that the previous government also recognized another question that had to be addressed, the question of the greater Toronto area, because we now live at a time where the greater Toronto area is very densely populated. You could almost make the case that we face the same sort of situation now on a large scale that the government faced in the early 1950s within the confines of the current Metro Toronto boundaries, where you have a highly developed, matured urban core surrounded by a suburban belt. The populations are about equal. We have about two million people within Metro and we have about two million people in the ring, which has come to be known as the GTA, that surrounds Metro. There are some parallels between the situations. We have a larger scale that we have to deal with now. Governments have to address that, have to look at, how do we recognize the reality that we have an urban core that is larger than it was when Metro was created in the early 1950s and we have a suburban belt that has expanded

beyond the Metro boundaries? We have to look at those questions.

Those questions — the question of Metro Toronto governance, the question of tax assessment reform and the question of the GTA — were all punted over to the Golden commission. The Golden commission took submissions from far and wide and eventually brought forward a report. My own community submitted a report to the Golden commission. In the fall of 1995 East York made a submission to the Golden commission and made a number of points in its submission.

In its document that was approved by council in September 1995, one of the recommendations, the first recommendation, was that there be revised boundaries for the borough of East York. Why? Four reasons were given. They recommended that there be revised boundaries "to promote wholeness of communities, divisions along natural and urban barriers, acceptable commercial/industrial to residential assessment ratios and regularized service areas." I'll address these one at a time.

First of all, "to promote wholeness of communities": One of the concerns that has been brought before our Bill 103 hearings over the past four or five weeks has been a concern that if the government's proposals on Bill 103 go forward it will shatter our communities, or that by erasing the municipal boundaries we currently have within Metro we will lose our communities. Well, East York in the fall of 1995 said we had to make some changes in order to promote the wholeness of communities, and I know why they said that: because communities are distinct from municipalities. We have communities within municipalities. The Beach is a community that is within the larger municipality of the city of Toronto. Forest Hill is a community that is within the larger municipality of Toronto. Municipal boundaries do not define those communities.

In East York we once upon a time had the town of Leaside, a very distinct community. That was amalgamated with the old township of East York in 1967. Leaside remains a community even though it was amalgamated. Those people who live in Leaside will tell you that there is a clear difference between Leaside and north Leaside, that those are two distinct communities in and of themselves. But those aren't defined by municipal boundaries; they're defined by the people who live there. They're defined by the church they go to, the stores they shop at, the stretch of sidewalk they walk along on Saturday afternoon, the schools their kids go to, all of those facts of everyday life. That's what defines communities, not lines on a municipal map.

We've got communities that cross, that span, that straddle municipal boundaries. In East York we have Greektown down at the south end, which includes a long stretch along the Danforth and south of the Danforth. That is not in East York, that is in east Toronto, but it extends up into East York. That is a very distinctive, very cohesive, very strong community, and it actually crosses the municipal line. That's what East York was talking about when they said they needed to make some changes to the municipal boundaries to promote wholeness of communities. Right now — the status quo — the municipal boundary divides that community. There are also

other communities East York identified that straddle municipal boundaries. Most significantly, across Victoria Park Avenue there's a community that's partly in East York and partly in Scarborough, centred on the park in that area. The park crosses Victoria Park as well.

One of the reasons for revised boundaries was that revising the boundaries would promote wholeness of communities. Translation: The current boundaries do not reflect the existing communities. Don't be fooled by people who say we need to keep our present municipalities, need to keep the status quo, because we need them to define our communities.

1630

"Divisions along natural and urban barriers." There's a recognition that the status quo does not recognize the current natural and urban barriers. We need a change there.

"Acceptable commercial/industrial to residential assessment ratios." That's a key one, because East York is saying there that unless there's a change made, the current commercial/industrial to residential assessment ratio is not acceptable, and it goes on at some length on that subject. I won't get into that because I'm getting the cut sign from my whip.

It comments also on the need for regularized service areas. I'll just quote briefly from the report: "Under the status quo, basic services such as garbage collection and snow clearing are impeded by awkward street borders." The status quo does not provide for regularized, natural, basic service delivery because there are unnatural boundaries that get in the way of delivering services.

I could go on at some length. I intended to get into the further rationale that led to the process of consultation this government has gone through over the past year leading up to Bill 103, the attack that has been made on Bill 103 culminating in last night's referendum, and the course that lies ahead of us, but I will now yield the floor to other speakers.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): I'm very happy to engage in this debate, which I think is of huge significance and importance to people not only in Metro Toronto but right across the province of Ontario.

I think what people said very clearly last night to this government was no, not only to megacity, but they also rejected this government's attempts to change our way of life in Ontario. They said no to a further erosion in their quality of life.

I think it's very clear and instructive that the opportunity that was given to the residents and citizens of Metropolitan Toronto to express their democratic views was greatly appreciated by those people as they turned out in some cases in record numbers: in North York, a 40% voting turnout for the referendum; not ever been done before in a municipal election campaign. It's quite clear that people right across Metropolitan Toronto wanted this opportunity to express themselves democratically. That should not be overlooked by this government.

When we started off this debate around the megacity and the idea of having a referendum, the idea of giving people the opportunity to have a say, at that time the government had no plans to have any real hearings on this matter. It was through our efforts in this Legislature,

through members of the opposition, both Liberal and NDP members, who suggested to the government that it was moving too quickly; that its haste would indeed make waste and that it was a problem; that it should heed the calls for people to have a say; that hearings were an important part of what we do, the business we conduct in this Legislative Assembly.

It's not just the opposition speaking for opposition's sake. We pointed out numerous times there were flaws with this legislation, flaws in the manner in which they were proceeding, that it did not give people an opportunity to be heard. Clearly, time and again, this government has ignored those calls on other occasions. There's a pattern here, a pattern at work whereby this government moves with lightning speed to bring forward their legislative agenda lest anyone take notice of what they're doing and begin to oppose it.

Well, the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto took notice and they said no. They said no to this government. They said no to the idea of a megacity which held out the promise of a bigger bureaucracy, huge increases in property taxes and an irresponsible downloading of very important services on to municipal property tax bases, one that could not be supported financially come the future.

People were very troubled indeed about what this government was about to do because they recognized a profound sense of loss, the profound sense that their communities were being threatened, jeopardized; that education would be threatened; that quality-of-life issues such as child care, long-term care, housing, the very essentials that maintain the threads that run through communities would be cut and that ultimately those communities could not be sustained. That's what the people of Metropolitan Toronto are saying today. That's what they said loudly and clearly through their No vote in the referenda.

When the government talks about there not being any alternative, it's important also to recognize that what we're talking about is an alternative that has a much broader vision. The vision of a megacity, the vision of a unified Metropolitan Toronto is a narrow vision. It does not take into account that there is an economic entity that we call the GTA, that it is an entity that has been growing, that it is bound together through the economic initiatives that have been undertaken. Economic activity does not stop at Steeles Avenue. There's another city there. There's Vaughan, there's York. We need the integration of services — transportation, sewer and water — so what we're calling for is a much greater vision of the GTA. That's the alternative vision.

It's in keeping with what has already taken place throughout the years historically. Metro came about as a result of the recognition for the need to integrate those services because there was a larger entity that was emerging. What you're calling for is too narrow a vision.

What we're asking you to do is to stop and look at these alternatives, because as Anne Golden put it, "We will be entertaining an American-style urban nightmare with your proposals and the downloading that that entails." So I ask the members in the back bench in particular, the Metropolitan Toronto members of this

government, sitting backbenchers, to consider voting against their government on Bill 103 and voting with us today on our resolution to put an end to Bill 103.

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke-Rexdale): I'm certainly glad to join in this debate today in terms of several issues that face this government, and I want to build a case for a rational justification for change. I want to start with the whole area of amalgamated councils.

When I spoke on this subject approximately two months ago, one of the prime justifications I gave in my remarks at that time involved the necessity of introducing and injecting greater accountability into local government decision-making within Metropolitan Toronto. I have cited publicly at my town hall meeting as well as in this Legislature that under the current system, the two-tiered system of regional government that we have in Metropolitan Toronto, we have an exquisite system of diffused accountability in government. That is to say, when local government has to make up its budgets for tax purposes in a budgetary context, the Metro level of government plus the school boards simply hand over to the local councils how much money they are going to have to raise on their mill rate.

The Metro level of government does not have to justify why it requires whatever its expenditures are for that year, 1997 or 1971. It just passes the bill on and under the Municipal Act, the local governments in Metro Toronto simply create whatever the amount of money is required to tax all kinds of commercial, industrial and residential ratepayers across Metropolitan Toronto. Hence, we have an extremely diffused system of accountability for the taxpayer.

Who created this situation in terms of how much money was raised? You can say it's the school board, it's the local council. We do not have a clear line of accountability in this diffused system of government in Metro today.

1640

Taking it from there, when we first went to elected council in Etobicoke in 1988, the first priority of the Metro council under direct election was: "Please provide us, you local councillors, with the Metro portion of the tax dollar. We don't care how you raise it, we simply want our money. We won't wait 30 days. You can go out and borrow it." That's what was called greater accountability by the Peterson government when it introduced that legislation. In my estimation, that was diffused accountability because the taxpayer to this day still does not necessarily know who is responsible for what. It led to the Who Does What panel.

Bill 103 will clearly establish that line of accountability. There will be 44 councillors and an elected mayor, and when the taxpayer asks himself or herself, "Who raised this money?" they can go to those 44 councillors. There's no other line of people back here saying, "It's those folks who are responsible." That's the prime justification in my estimation for an amalgamated, unified Toronto. That's why it is inexorably linked to the whole situation of changing the property assessment system across this urban area.

We have right now a system which according to the critics — and I have listened for almost five weeks,

hearing them say: "I don't see any reason for any change. Everything is working just fine." If everything is working just fine, I guess if you were looking at the Toronto Sun's "It's Politically Taxing" on Sunday of this week, it's very evident you were a recipient of lower taxes in certain parts of Metropolitan Toronto. Using the mayors as profiles, there are two examples here that in my estimation show another justification for the need for fundamental change.

We have the mayor of the city of Toronto, who lives at a given address and pays right now, would you guess, \$1,513. Under the market value assessment proposal that the previous government had introduced and then decided while it was in committee that it would sideline and get rid of, the mayor of the city of Toronto today would be paying \$3,204 — nearly double. But under the existing assessment system where you can have six councils, or even more, because we have to have communities protected under the existing system, if you go to Mayor Holyday in the city of Etobicoke, which is in central Etobicoke, where there are not as many taxpayers who would benefit under a property assessment reform — get this, Speaker — Mr Holyday pays \$5,050 for a property at his address. Under market value assessment, he would pay \$2,957. That's almost a 45% reduction.

However, if you listen to the critics in the committee, they say there's hardly any problems. In other words, they're either deliberately blissfully unaware or they're completely ignorant of the extremely inequitable and unjust property assessment system we have in this area, in this urban form, and they're prepared to say it's fine to stick with this present existing inequitable system. That is one of the other reasons why we need to make these changes, not only for residential taxpayers but also for commercial and industrial.

If you look at the books that were put out by the Metro treasury department back in 1992-93, there are innumerable examples. I don't want to get into the quotes but they are certainly here. Generally speaking, not in every instance, but usually in most examples — I would say 90% of them across northern Etobicoke — commercial and industrial taxpayers would benefit by tax relief under the old MVA. If you tie the old system or the new one in with an amalgamated, unified city of Toronto, you can see the necessity and justification for bringing equity and fairness to taxpayers across this city. That's one of the fundamental reasons, I believe, that we hide behind the code words of democracy and concern for democratic features in Metropolitan Toronto. They may not like to accept that reality, but I have to come to the conclusion that is certainly one of the things they're hiding behind.

Which leads me to the third reason why we need a unified city, not only for tax relief under the old system or under actual value assessment, but if we can get some tax relief to the folks who own the businesses, who create the jobs in Metropolitan Toronto, and for those people who would be the potential entrepreneurs, that's another reason why we would like and need a new amalgamated city council with an amalgamated, unified, fair, equitable property assessment system. Taxes will be raised on a generally equitable basis, which means, by the way — everybody wants to make this connection but it needs to be

made — that those folks who are the entrepreneurs of tomorrow or the employers of today can then get on with certain stability and certainty that they can hire some people.

I have talked to innumerable folks who have come to my community action office or whom I've visited when I go to see businesses or in any other context, and they will tell you in many instances that there is a pile of jobs we could create within Metropolitan Toronto if we could get a more unified playing field. This is no more true than when you look at the hospitality and tourism industry on Dixon Road in Etobicoke-Rexdale. If you drive by and take a look at the product of those hotels, if you talk to the general managers, if you talk to the owners, if you talk to the employees, the workers who live there in the riding, who work there, who come from other parts of Metropolitan Toronto, they will tell you one general theme: The major corporations, the owners are not prepared to put new investment money into those properties because they are paying too high a room tax, too high a business tax, too high a hospitality tax.

What does that mean? A tired product. Where do they go? They move downtown. They don't stay at the airport because those hotels, with the general exception of three or four, are tired products. When you don't have good-looking products available, when you do not have a physical maintenance program in place that's required in many of these instances, you do not create the traffic into the hotels. You do not create the jobs that we need in this city of an amalgamated nature. We're not going to get those kinds of things, and the opposition should be looking at these propositions as much as the other stuff that they've been criticizing this government for.

I just want to reiterate those are three of the central reasons, in my estimation, why we need to change this system and bring some greater equity and balance so that we can create some jobs for people, which this side has not forgotten about at all. But the conditions weren't conducive, and still aren't, until we rectify those situations.

The Acting Speaker: The Chair would like to recognize, visiting our Ministry of Environment and Energy, in the Speaker's gallery, Ms Heidrun Heidecke, Minister of Environment and Energy for the state of Saxony-Anhalt in Germany. Welcome to our Legislature.

The Chair recognizes the member for York South.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I add my welcome to our distinguished visitor because our visitor is here seeing the House on what is a very significant day. It's not spring yet, but we still feel a sense of warm air and fresh air that's come in because of the referendum vote last night to what has been sort of dank and cold air across the way opposite; this freezing of people's minds, the idea that somehow there was a cynical approach that would work.

1650

This could be the day that marks the end of cynical politics in this House, the idea that this government, leaning only on slogans and publicly-paid-for commercials, thought it could push through things without people asking real questions, thought it could hide things away from people, thought it couldn't answer questions about

things like MVA, not release the studies, and all it has done instead is create quite the opposite. It has compounded people's concerns.

People didn't fall for the divide-and-conquer idea, the idea of vilifying the mayors or vilifying the people who are in the municipalities, trying time after time. It has failed utterly, and in that failure I think is a good day for Ontario, a very good day, the idea that there cannot be this artificial type of politics practised any longer. It means more than a better future for Metropolitan Toronto.

People in my riding were subject to that cynical assumption on the part of this government that it needs to break the habit of. They thought that maybe people in the city of York, with their difficult economic times, would lend themselves to this kind of project, to a bill that tells them nothing about their future, to the simple wide assurance of this government to say: "Give up on your local elected officials; don't look for any representation." Instead, people from areas as diverse as Baby Point and Jane and Woolner all voted in ratios of 2 to 1 and 3 to 1 against this government's cynical megacity proposal, the proposal that would have taken \$1 billion out of this city and also taken away that essential character we have in terms of this complex metropolitan area, a complexity and a desirability obviously not yet understood by enough of the members opposite, because even today in the Legislature we learned that the megacity proposal stands, in their eyes.

We learned also last night that the town of Mount Dennis, the birthplace of Municipal Affairs Minister Al Leach, has rejected him as he tried to reject them, that some 4,643 people in ward 7 said no to the megacity, compared to only 1,700 who could fall to the blandishments of this government, to this simplistic idea that somehow they would look after Toronto even as they plundered it. People's seeing through this cynical manoeuvre give us the basis for some hope in this House today.

The significance is not simply for the members opposite, many of whom squirm in their seats, looking at their legitimacy in question, the whole basis that brought them into this House. This referendum — admittedly not as tidy, not as neat but certainly not subject to the kind of criticism we've heard from the side opposite in the House — the government had the power to tidy up that referendum, to change it any way they wanted, to vary the question if they thought it would make it fairer. They can't come and complain afterwards and say this isn't the finding.

Instead we see a clear finding, an unequivocal finding that nobody from any part of this province sitting across can say that the people of Metropolitan Toronto have not rejected Bill 103. I would say today that it's only a matter of time before this House comes to that arrangement and that agreement itself. While the numbers may say that they have 81 members and that we have many less, that they have the legal authority, they have lost the moral authority to rearrange affairs in Metropolitan Toronto, and that's painfully evident to everyone across the country, let alone this province, today. We see that loss of legitimacy, the basis of a broken trust, and we see

the members opposite having to wrestle with a very difficult decision with their vote today.

Will the members opposite try and repair that trust? Will they show that most essential thing for all governments, some sense of character, the ability to admit that they're wrong? Will we see that from the members opposite today and in subsequent actions in the House? Will they recognize that when asked, after much discussion that they tried to close, people did not want to live in Mike Harris's Toronto? It was proposed and it was rejected.

Instead we have in front of us the possibility of this government trying to repair its broken trust, for us to move with something that was a byproduct, a certainly unintended, and I'm sure for the members opposite an unfortunate creation of the megacity debate as it evolved, the chance to do better, the chance to have a civic assembly that would bring together this interest that has been brought out on the part of the people. If it isn't responded to, if you don't give that some life today by drawing back Bill 103, I would say to the government members opposite, look what happens when you close hospitals, watch what happens when you try to dilute the quality of the classroom, because the same thing is going to happen again.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate? The Chair recognizes the member for High Park — I'm sorry, Fort York.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): Mr Speaker, that's all right. I know it takes some time to identify us.

It's a pleasure for me to speak to the motion we have before us. I want to start by congratulating the countless deputations we have heard over the last four and a half weeks, individuals who have taken time out of their lives to come to depute because they felt strongly about what this government was about to do to them. Many of them came here day in and day out not just to make their deputation but to sit in as well.

I said to this wonderful woman who is approximately 79 years old: "Why is it that you come here daily? Is it because you like punishment?" She said, "No, I am here because I am angry." This 79-year-old woman was here day in and day out because she is angry at what this government is doing. This is only one bill out of many of the bills they are uncorking daily.

But as people discover what is contained in some of these bills, beyond the title, which belies what is within it, people are discovering there's a problem they have to deal with. I thank each and every one of those deputations, because in my view they were poems, each and every one of them, individual testimonies of why people wanted to preserve local democracy, local autonomy and their local government. They're afraid of losing it. That's why they were here day in and day out.

I have to tell you that this kind of advice and expertise, which under different circumstances would be very costly, was being offered to this government for free, expertise from countless individuals who came to try to assist this government with their ideas. Under normal circumstances, we would lap it up as politicians, but not with this government. This government is completely disregarding everything they have to say, as if the individual testimony of evidence was insufficient.

We had other evidence by other experts. We have had Professor Kitchen and Professor Sancton comment on amalgamation because they have done worldwide studies and have shown that there is no amalgamation that has been done that saves money. That's what drives this Reform-minded government. They want to do this, they've said, to save money. But the evidence is irrefutable, at least for those who can read and want to try to understand the issue; Professors Sancton and Kitchen and many other experts.

Another individual, Mr Wendell Cox, an American, has done a study of amalgamations and has shown that it's a particular problem. About the things that are happening, he argues that smaller governments are more accountable, smaller governments are more responsive, smaller local governments are more attuned to communities and neighbourhoods; and that larger governments are more susceptible to special interests.

By the way, he's not referring to poor people's special interest, he's not referring to people with disabilities' special interest, he's not referring to women as a special interest, he's not referring to aboriginal people as a special interest, he's not referring to battered women as a special interest, the very women who are looking for family benefits that this government has refused to correct, because it has caused the bungling; these are not special interests that are about to influence this legacy. No. M. Cox is talking about your friends as the special interest, the very developers you were trying to help, who have come in front of this committee saying, "We like amalgamation." The developers — in fact I've got their brief — came and said, "We like amalgamation." Why? Because these poor people who are scratching for money are upset to have to go to Toronto for a planning permit. They're upset to have to go to Etobicoke, Scarborough, East York, York, North York and Metro, because, you see, they've been impoverished by the economy. So each time they have to make a trip down to Toronto or some other municipality, it's costly for them, very intimidating for these rich developers who don't have any political experience whatsoever.

They came and said to Leach — they probably had a good lunch together, perhaps in one of these fancy Italian restaurants downtown — they talked about it and said, "M. Leach, how do we solve this problem because we're impoverished, we have been impoverished by the NDPers before you, and now we need you to come and give us a hand because we are not making enough money." So Leach said, "Don't worry, my friends, we're going to solve it."

I know M. Leach said something else prior to the election. "Yes, it is true, I wanted to eliminate Metro, but I have learned the error of my ways." Mike Harris too, who said prior to the election, "We need to get rid of Metro and keep local government," has learned the error of his ways. When confronted by the shadow cabinet titled "the developers" who manipulate the marionette and pull the string, Mike said: "I'm with you. I have learned the error of my ways." The developers and their corporate friends and the corporate raiders have a great deal of influence on these easily manipulated Tories who are in hand want to fix the agenda for the corporations

and these poor starving developers. That's what it's about.

By the way, for your information, M. Leach unilaterally, just about last year, it was last year, decided that what he needed to do was to relax the basement drainage protection rules and he eliminated the full-height insulation requirement. Again, he must have had a good lunch with some of the developers at one of the fancy Italian restaurants, possibly French. Leach and possibly Mike Harris might have been at the same luncheon and they talked about this — the Urban Development Institute of which M. Kells was a former president — they sat down together. We know, they talked, and they said: "Premier, M. Leach, help us out, because these measures, the full-height insulation for basements and the elimination of the drainage," which keeps water out of basements, "cost too much money for the new homeowner. But if you take that requirement off, we're going to save anywhere from \$1,000 to \$3,000 for the new homeowner." It was fascinating. So M. Leach said, "Oh, that's fine, we can do that." And he did.

Interjection: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr Marchese: I don't know what I'm talking about? This fine gentleman here — I don't have the time to find out where he's from — says I don't have any knowledge of what I speak. I don't know where he's coming from, but as the critic for Municipal Affairs and Housing, I know where I'm coming from. M. Leach had lunch with the fine developers from the Urban Development Institute and they talked about getting rid of two essential areas: elimination of full-height insulation requirement and relaxing of the basement drainage protection rules. They would save money, they said.

The Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, made up by the way of many interesting groups, some of them your corporate friends, did a study to determine whether or not there were savings, because the developers said there were going to be savings for the homeowner. They did the research and this is what they say: "A survey of home builders" — which they released at the news conference — "reveals that an earlier revocation of another energy efficiency standard" — the one I just referred to — "last summer did not reduce the price tag of a new home by \$1,000 as Housing Minister Al Leach had claimed it would. In fact, the survey shows the prices being charged for these less energy efficient houses are higher."

Isn't that the argument this fine, Reform-minded government is making, that if we amalgamate we're going to save money? It's the same argument. But the evidence is proving that when you amalgamate into a bigger structure you don't save any money. Individual testimony proved it. The evidence by Professors Kitchen and Sancton has proved it.

Are we to believe these people? They're about to get rid of development charges and they say, "God, when you take those development charges that new homeowner is going to benefit because the housing prices are going to drop by anywhere up to \$20,000."

If you were to believe M. Leach when he says you're going to save \$1,000 if you could get rid of the full-

height insulation requirement and the drainage requirement, if you would have believed him, you would have thought the new homeowner saved money. But that's not what drives the prices for homes. It's not that. And what do you think the developer did? He pocketed the money. The poor developers who have been scratching and scraping under our government are pocketing the money.

Speaker, I'm glad you're listening, because some of your friends over here aren't. They're reading, they've got other things to do. I appreciate that, but I have to tell you that the people of Metropolitan Toronto are quite angry and the anger is palpable wherever you go.

I remind you, Bill 86 — your bill, not mine; the bill that you passed in late December — allows the municipalities to do several things. First, "Municipalities may pass bylaws providing for the use of alternative voting methods such as phone or mail-in voting," including the Internet. My friends, my Tory friends — I've got a few; not too many, but a few — this is what you passed. You passed this, not me. You did it. You also said here in the same bill, "Municipalities, elected local boards and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing are entitled to have questions placed on the ballot," which is what you called a referendum in committee when we were dealing with it.

In committee you fine, honourable members who were part of this hearing to deal with Bill 86 said that municipalities would have the power in between elections to have a referendum, and that's what the people of Metropolitan Toronto did. It's fine for you fine, honourable Tory members to dismiss it now as just a public opinion poll, but when you were dealing with Bill 86, your bill, you called it a referendum, that municipalities would be able to have a referendum. I remember the language. I was there; I was in committee.

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: I'm waiting with delight for the member for Durham Centre to speak. I'm always interested in his views. When your turn comes around, please refute what I said, what you said in this bill.

I remind the fine, honourable members, this bill has permitted our municipalities to do what they have done, and what have they done? They have voted overwhelmingly in Metro to say no to the megacity. That's what they said. They didn't say no to parts of the bill; they said no to the bill in its entirety.

When Harris comes around, when he and his Harrisites and other disciples come around and say, "We're listening," they're not listening very well, because people have rejected and refuted the entire bill. When Mikey comes around — I apologize. When the Premier comes around and says, "We will make amendments," we are not interested in amendments. The people of Metropolitan Toronto are not interested in amendments. They are rejecting the entire bill. But if there's something you want to do, those of you who have fumbled the ball — one of the previous speakers used a football analogy and talked about our previous government "punting" something or other. You people have fumbled the ball on this issue and the people of Metropolitan Toronto picked up the ball and ran with it. They ran with that ball and they've said no to your referendum.

You might listen to our leader and Tony Silipo and the others who spoke on this issue today. We are proposing a citizens' assembly to deal with two issues, Metro and the GTA. We need Metro and the GTA to be reformed in a different governance structure to deal with transportation, to deal with economic development, to deal with environmental issues and regional planning. Those are the issues we need to define, and our party has put forward that proposal. We hope this government will listen to that suggestion.

1710

Mr Douglas B. Ford (Etobicoke-Humber): I like looking around this chamber. They're discussing Bill 103, and most of these people in the chamber are from the Toronto area, which I am very familiar with from many years ago. I watched this city grow from the dirt roads, the milk wagons and the service wagons that had horse and wagon. I listened to some of the chatter as I was a little boy, and the greatest economist I ever met in my whole life was my mother. My mother had nine children and she didn't take any welfare and she had the kind of pride I haven't seen for many, many years.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): What's that got to do with Bill 103?

Mr Ford: I'm talking about Bill 103. Please: I gave you your time; I would like my time.

We're talking about living in two rooms with nine kids. The older ones took care of the younger ones. My mother worked every single day of her life. She used to brush my hair and I used to say to her, "When I get older, you'll never have to work," and she used to laugh. Every day I'd see her go out and I'd see her come back with a bag of groceries or something. Heating those two rooms — I used to go down to the coal cars down on Eastern Avenue, take the coal, put it in a bucket and bring it home on my wagon.

Some of you people don't even know what life's all about. You're always talking about more money, more money. It was disgraceful the way the NDP squandered the wealth of this province. You can smile, but you wasted that money and squandered it. You'd better bow, because you know something? That's very difficult.

As for you people, you're the same and your government in Ottawa's the same.

Mr Gerretsen: Now you're going too far. We're not going to take that.

Mr Ford: Yeah, that's right. I'll tell you one other thing. You talk about this government here; this government is concerned. The government has been listening to the public and the people up there and the people over there who are lobbying from the audience every day. I've been listening and I watch them all. I wonder if they've got time or they work for a living. I don't know.

The government has been listening to the public. Over 600 deputations —

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. No, please take your seat. The Chair recognizes the member for Cochrane South on a point of order.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): Mr Speaker, there is a long-standing tradition in this Legislature that members in debate not only respect the members of the

assembly, but certainly to God we respect the public, the people we're here to serve. I am sure I heard the member opposite make extremely derogatory comments about the public who come to view the proceedings here at the Legislature. Speaker, I don't think that is acceptable.

The Acting Speaker: Take your seat. I was listening carefully to the speaker. I did not hear him say anything unparliamentary.

Interjections.

Mr Bisson: What a bunch of Fascists. You're a bunch of Fascists.

Mr Ford: A Fascist? You don't even know what a Fascist is.

The Acting Speaker: Order. I would ask the member or Cochrane South to withdraw those remarks.

Mr Bisson: Speaker, if the member is allowed to call the public a bunch of no-goods — I withdraw, Mr speaker, if —

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. Please take your seat and come to order. The Chair recognizes the member for Etobicoke-Humber.

Mr Ford: Everyone agrees that the status quo is not an option. The mayors, the business community, even the leader of the Opposition all agree there must be change. We are impressed by the fact, according to a survey in the Toronto Sun, that residents, when presented with governing alternatives, support the government's proposal.

Interjections.

Mr Ford: Are we still talking? Thank you.

When this government has 75% of the people don't show up, with all the pressure groups, with all the various mail pieces, and with all the garbage on the streets, with these referendums floating around on the streets, I don't think that a proper election.

We are impressed by the fact that according to a survey in the Toronto Sun, residents when presented with the facts on governing alternatives, support the government's proposal. I repeat that because that's a fact.

Mr Gerretsen: Time out. Look at the whip. The whip says, "Time out."

The Acting Speaker: Member for Kingston and The Islands, come to order.

Mr Bisson: The whip is too embarrassed by what you're saying and he wants you to sit down.

Mr Ford: Why don't you shut your mouth.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Please take your seat.

Mr Ford: The whip says I should sit down because my friend across the floor can't keep quiet.

Mr Pouliot: He's the reason I'm against cloning.

The Acting Speaker: Would the member for Lake Simcoe come to order as well. I would like to remind the member for Cochrane South that I will not warn him again.

Mr Bisson: Mr Speaker, on a point of order —

The Acting Speaker: No. The chair recognizes the member for Etobicoke-Humber.

Mr Gerretsen: No, he doesn't want to speak any more.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I'm pleased to join the debate and to be supportive of what my colleague has introduced in the House.

Before I make my remarks, let me say that I'm totally delighted and I want to compliment the municipalities within Metro for the amount of work they have done during the past month or so, trying to bring to the attention of the people what Bill 103 actually is and continues to be. A special compliment goes to the city of North York, the mayor, and everyone who got involved in getting this absolutely tremendous turnout, that 79.4%, which is higher than the turnout during the last normal municipal election. If we can't pay heed to that, then I wonder what we have to pay attention to.

Interjections.

Mr Sergio: I don't think they like the results, so I can sympathize with them, and while we are indulging ourselves with the result that the people have given to this government and to us yesterday, they may not like it unfortunately, but I hope they pay attention, because not only during the past four weeks or so that we have had public hearings, but even yesterday, those people have exercised their will, their right. In doing so they wanted to send a message to the people on the other side, to the Premier, to the minister, and still today they say, "We don't have to listen to what the people have said."

It is most unfortunate that they don't like to hear the truth from the people who are most affected. The funny thing is this: Even our side and the people who are being affected have been saying: "We can support some change. We can support some minor changes, if you will, and we can go along with that. But certainly as to the bill as it has been presented, and its contents, the process with which it's being pushed through, we can't accept that."

The minister himself said this is going to be a good base. The funny thing is he doesn't have any building plans to build on this foundation. We already have a strong foundation here. We have a very strong and vibrant bunch of communities that through good government have been able to deliver the best local government in the country. Why would we want to destroy that? We have had people who continuously have been saying, and among those people who have been speaking on behalf of Bill 103 and its contents we have had local people, people from across Metro, lawyers, engineers, architects famous throughout the world come and tell us, "Don't destroy what you have here." These are the people we should be listening to. If there is a message the people wanted to send to the government it was yesterday: "Look, we don't like Bill 103. We don't like what you're doing. We don't like the content. We don't like the way you're going about it, so give us a chance to work with you, with the government."

1720

The changes that we feel are necessary and that we can support can be done in such a way that will be acceptable to you, the government, and to us, the people who have to pay the bills. When Mr Harris was saying, "We don't want you to feel like spectators but we want you to feel like part of the process and not solely like people paying the bills and being spectators alone," what has changed in the mind of the government and in the mind of the

Premier? I would urge the government, because my time is up, unfortunately, the members on that side over there, first to support our views and the ones of the people who have sent the message not to approve of the bill at the committee level, and then to tell the Premier, tell the ministers to go back and redraw in accordance with the will of the people.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): In the very brief three minutes that we have to deal with this motion I'd like to go back to the motion, a motion that's filled with myths, half-truths, rhetoric, out-of-context quotes, which are typical of exactly what the party that is espousing this motion has been putting forward in the committee hearings, has been putting forward at town hall meetings. There is no Liberal plan, there is no Liberal vision, there is no Liberal sense of how we take Toronto, a great city, and make it greater. Their only suggestion is that we're wrong, that they're right; they don't have a plan, they can't tell you exactly what they'd do differently, but that our vision is wrong. What do they offer up as proof of that? All 60 studies that were done in the last five years — 60 studies that deal with the issue of consolidating municipal services, and every one of those studies concluded that there were incredible dollars to be saved by consolidation — they would have you believe that every one of those studies was flawed.

They would have you believe that the work of Mr Crombie's committee, which came out split at the end — Mr Crombie himself supported the idea of amalgamation, but in fairness, Hazel McCallion and a few others were on that committee, and I don't know who voted how, but not surprisingly it was not unanimous in its support. Some wanted to see a different federation within Toronto. When we looked at the two choices, it was clear to us that there was only one direction to proceed in if we were truly committed to doing the best job for the taxpayers of this city, truly committed to the idea that you could live with smaller government with fewer politicians, that you could end duplication and overlap, that you really could find a vision for Metro Toronto as one common market looking around the world, seizing new investment, seizing new jobs. That is the vision we articulated in Bill 103.

Clearly, as was expressed last night, the people of this city have concerns about this bill, but lumped in there are concerns about a number of other issues that have nothing to do with Bill 103. Obviously the provincial government, recognizing all the input we've had so far, should take the time to consider what we heard last night, take the time to consider what we've heard in the legislative committee hearings, what we've heard at town hall meetings, what we've heard face to face with our constituents across all of Metro, and we're going to do that over the next month. The result of that consideration will be even more amendments, even more specificity to how this bill will deal with the challenges that face Toronto not today but in the years and the decades to come.

I'm very proud that we've laid out a vision. I'm proud that we were the first government to take action, to recognize the failings, to recognize the opportunities to move forward and bring a bill that will guarantee more jobs and more prosperity in Metro Toronto in the decades to come.

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North): This is an important day in the historic life of the greater Toronto area. March 3, 1997, is an important day for Ontario, and most important, it is an important day for democracy.

This government decided to declare war — they call it a revolution — on democracy. They decided that if they are in power with any kind of majority, they have this power to do anything they want. The people of this province and the people of greater Toronto told them that if they feel they can take democracy in their hands and be a dictator and a bully to the people of this province, they will show them. They even tried to regard the referendum that they introduced in this House, the process that they introduced, to say it's no good.

They spoke so loudly, so emphatically: 76% of the people said no, and no means no. If you think it ends today — it's just the beginning of what's to come. They're going to make sure that they squeeze Bill 103 into the ground, as much as all those who are posturing over there and talking about how they don't care what the results are.

I am so happy that democracy reigns so high and loud on the deaf ears of many of their ministers and their members over there; that the people have said, "If you continue, we'll continue to make sure that democracy reigns."

Bill 103 is just a little example — it's the son of Bill 26 — the same way they bullied through 26, the same way they want to do 104, without any consultation, without any involvement of the people. The people will stand up and say, "No way." They also stated that bigger doesn't mean better.

They would like to suppress all the communities they can find, especially those that are not funded by any sort of well-oiled machinery of money. People want to be heard. It is their community. They don't want to be marginalized by a bunch of thugs who believe they can push anything through without hearing the people. They are standing up to be heard. If they continue, although they may stay a long time, in the next election, these people won't be around — I know some of them are such tall and good individuals, they're coming to their senses.

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): Name the members. Point them out.

Mr Curling: My good friend from Scarborough West is saying: "I have to think very deeply about how I vote. I may have to change my mind, not be pushed by the whip."

I heard the member for High Park-Swansea is saying, "I also may have to change my mind if we get a vote telling us that we have to go in another direction."

I'm very happy about it. I have hope in the people. I have hope that even some of the Conservative members are changing their tune now. If your whip will say to you, "You must toe the party line," go to your conscience, because I'm telling you, my friends, the people are watching you and they want to deep-six 103 in all the ways they can. It's dead. We want to give it a nice, decent funeral. So we are asking you first to give it that kind of funeral or else we personally, with the people, will bury 103 in the way it deserves, without any representation by the people themselves.

I am so happy today that democracy is alive and well. This is only the beginning, where we will tell you and tell you emphatically that your days are numbered. But again, there is hope for you to change your minds and to come forward for a full consultation and involvement with the people. They want their community and they will defend it in the best way they can. I hope that you have listened carefully. Yesterday, March 3, 1997, was a great day for democracy.

730

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): From the time the two co-founders of Toronto, Governor Simcoe and Moll-terczy, founded Toronto, Toronto carefully built up its reputation as a city that works. In fact, we are in the enviable position today that the whole world says Toronto is the best place in which to live. But this Bill 103 is now coming to its detriment, and we in Parkdale especially, a local community, see in the future what will happen when Bill 103 bulldozes its way down the throats of the residents who voted overwhelmingly to defeat this bill.

Just imagine, as it stands right now, here's the future: the services that are presently provided in Metro Toronto and not provided in the 905 area, people will want these services and consequently will go to and live in those areas where the services are provided. We see that happening today. You take one example, and that is the mental health centre on Queen Street. What happens is that if anybody in Halton — as far away as Halton is our catchment area — has a mental health care problem, they will end up, as it is today, on Queen Street. Consequently, because the services are not there back in Halton, they will therefore stay in our area, and that would mean there's a great imbalance, a great shift.

As was said before the committee by Mr Philip, who was a former minister of the NDP, the poor have moved from the outer regions of Toronto into the Toronto area, consequently we are paying a great deal in terms of the welfare costs. Should there come a recession, and we might find ourselves in one very quickly, you will find that indeed that has taken place.

The Acting Speaker: The Speaker ruled earlier on the demonstration and on the signs. I wanted to warn you that I'm taking a very dim view of seeing them.

Mr Ruprecht: To conclude my remarks, I just wanted simply to tell you what is happening here, that there will be a shift of population, a shift of the more poor in our society to where the services are. In short, you will see Americanization and consequent destruction of the inner city. I'm sure the Conservatives, and especially the backbenchers who know this process will take place, will want to have this on their conscience.

Consequently along with our leader and our party, we're asking you to search your conscience because you know this move is taking place today. This move will be gravated from the 905 into the Metro area to a much greater degree when Bill 103 is passed. We're asking you to try to kill it, review it and ensure that this does not take place.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): I'm the last speaker for our caucus on this resolution and I want to take off the top that I will speak in favour of the resolution.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Under standing order 42(f) it says:

"The Speaker or the Chair of the committee of the whole House, as the case may be, shall apportion the time available for any matter to be debated or considered under this standing order equally among the recognized parties in the House. The time for a reply by the mover of a motion under this standing order shall be included in the time apportioned to the party of which the mover is a member."

Mr Speaker, you saw earlier this afternoon that the member for Etobicoke-Humber was attempting to make a speech in this House. He was continually interrupted by members of the third party, the NDP. I would ask —

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: It is a point of order. I asked the member for Etobicoke-Humber if he wanted to continue, and he felt that his time was up, I think, so I would ask the member for Rainy River to continue.

Hon Mr Sterling: Perhaps you could hear my point of order in total so that I could explain it to you.

Mr Hampton: Mr Speaker, can he do this on his own time, please? Have him bring it up at the end of the time.

Hon Mr Sterling: Perhaps previous points of order would have been raised on your own time too, Mr Speaker.

The point is this: These debates are time-limited. The member for Cochrane South continued to interrupt the member for Etobicoke-Humber, thereby robbing the governing party of its fair share of time in this debate. I would ask you to reallocate some of the time of the New Democratic Party to the governing party so we could have our fair share of the time in this debate.

The Acting Speaker: Order, please. It is a point of order, and I have some degree of sympathy with it. The time, I feel, if it should have been reapportioned, already is. I would ask the member for Rainy River to continue.

Mr Hampton: Speaker, when I started, I believe I had 13 minutes. I wonder if you could return the clock back to 13 minutes, please.

I rise to support this resolution, and I rise to support this resolution because — there are many reasons why it should be supported, but at the end of the day, for me, I support this resolution because what we have seen with respect to Bill 103 from this government, from the beginning until just a few moments ago with the member opposite, is a complete disregard for the workings of democracy. We have seen contempt shown for the electorate, we have seen contempt shown for the democratically elected councillors, the democratically elected mayors within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto.

We have seen a government that is so desperate to ram through its legislation and to ram through the process that it goes to court and argues that it still has the royal prerogative. My God, the House of Lords gave up on the royal prerogative in Great Britain in 1946, but this government is so desperate, so incredibly desperate to dictate to people, that it goes to court and argues it still has the royal prerogative.

Thank God we have judges in this province who weren't appointed by this government. Thank God we

have judges who simply read the case and say to this government: "Get out of here. You can't use the royal prerogative to appoint trustees which legislation won't allow you to appoint." I say to the member for Scarborough East, who tried to carry this abomination for the government, that the High Court judge said you were breaking the law. The High Court judge said you were showing no respect for responsible government. That's what the High Court judge said, but you don't even listen to him.

So here we are today: The people of Toronto have voted. Over 76% of them have said to the government, "We don't want your megacity, we don't want your Bill 103, we're opposed to it," and what is the government's response? Do they show some humility? Do they show some respect for democracy? No, none. What we heard from the person who claims to be the Minister for Municipal Affairs, although we're not sure any more — he claims to be the Minister for Municipal Affairs — is more stonewalling, more arrogance, more contempt and, frankly, more disrespect for democracy.

But that's not the end of it, because we understand that the government is now putting together a scheme for amendments. Let's call these amendments what they are: It's trying to give this tired bill a new hairdo. It's trying to dress it up with some bells and whistles and say to people, "We've done something with it." Frankly, it demonstrates again that this is a government that doesn't listen to people. This is a government that thinks democracy is exercised once every four years, and whoever wins the election then gets the right to dictate. That is becoming every day more and more clear. That is the attitude of this government. They won an election a year and a half ago; now they get to do whatever they want to whomever they want whenever they want. That's their attitude.

1740

I want to point out what we understand is now the government's strategy for amendments. We understand that the government is thinking of not introducing their amendments until we come back in April, and we won't see the amendments until we go to committee of the whole. This is what this government calls debate. This is what this government calls democratic discussion.

The people of the province, and especially the people who live within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto, need to know exactly what this government has in mind. There has been, in effect, a time allocation motion by this government to deal with this bill, and the time allocation motion limits debate in committee of the whole to one hour. In other words, the amendments that this government says are going to redress all that is wrong with Bill 103 are going to have exactly one hour of public airing, one hour of debate.

What a demonstration that you have learned absolutely nothing. What a demonstration that your fallback position is to be more arrogant than ever, to be more anti-democratic than ever, to be more dictatorial than ever, that you think you can come in here with the amendments at the last minute and you can limit them to one hour's debate and think that is possibly going to suffice. What a sad, sad, sorry lot you are.

I will read, just for the record, the time allocation motion, because people need to know what this government is now planning: "That one hour shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in committee of the whole." That's quoting directly from the time allocation motion. "At the end of that time those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House."

In other words, what this government calls amendments, what this government calls debate and discussion, is nothing but the long march conducted quickly, in one hour's time: further demonstration you have learned nothing. If anything, your defeat in the referendum has made you more anti-democratic, has made you more arrogant and has made you show even more contempt for the public.

The fact of the matter is that anybody who has attended even the committee has gone away from the committee with the feeling that the government members are not interested in listening one bit, that the government members snicker, that the government members guffaw, that the government members attack anybody who presents any position which argues with the bill or which criticizes the bill.

All that is happening, everything that has happened from day one from the person who calls himself the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is saying, "No need for debate" — he even said that all that was needed was very limited public hearings. He said no need for discussion, no need for consultation with anyone, no need for referendum. "Don't hold a referendum; we'll ignore it." Everything that has gone on from day one, and everything that continues from this government, shows nothing but contempt for the people. Nothing but contempt; nothing but arrogant disregard.

There are probably a dozen reasons why I would support this resolution. I would support it because I know that this whole megacity scheme will not work. I know that this whole megacity scheme is going to render Toronto an urban environment much closer to Detroit and much more like Detroit than the present-day Toronto is. I know from what I've heard that there are no efficiencies in a city of 2.3 million people. In fact, efficiencies of scale start to disappear after one million population.

We know that there is no integrity to this concept. This concept is being presented, is being pushed by the government, because they want to create confusion within Metropolitan Toronto. It furthers their real agenda of downloading \$531 million in costs, if not more than that, on to the property tax. That is a good reason for voting against it.

I should vote against it and I should support this resolution because, frankly, this whole scheme does not address any of the issues that were identified in the Golden report; it doesn't address the issues that were identified by the Crombie report; it doesn't deal with the issues that were identified by the Metropolitan council itself; it doesn't deal with the issues of spillovers between

Toronto and the GTA; it doesn't deal with the issues of the externalities of economies; it doesn't deal with the issues of urban sprawl, which cost this province about \$1 billion a year in additional costs; it doesn't deal with coordination of transportation; it doesn't deal with any of those things. I should support this resolution for that reason as well.

But what it comes down to for me is that this government has learned absolutely nothing through this whole process, nothing. They are just as arrogant today as they were when they introduced the bill. They show contempt today for the public, just as they showed contempt when they introduced the bill. They show complete disregard for democratic process now, just as they did when they introduced the bill. They've learned nothing.

Oh, possibly they have learned something: They're learning to hide that contempt a little better. They say now, "We'll introduce amendments," but we have to do a little research before we find that their plan for introducing the amendments is not to introduce them till the last minute and then force-march them through the House. They're learning a better disguise, that's about it. For that reason, we'll be supporting this resolution.

Mr Colle: The last speaker reminded me of the path the government has gone on in terms of Bill 103. As you know, this started with a minister and a government being found — a case was established for contempt of the Legislature for the first time in the history of this province, unprecedented. Even the courts supported the opposition, supported the people who said that putting appointed trustees in control of local governments and making these trustees basically above the law, not subject to the courts, was illegal. The courts had to come in and say that.

The Speaker had intervened. This government still did not listen. It still drives ahead, trying to bulldoze any opposition. It has a smugness about it. It has a contempt for people. They are so arrogant that even despite the fact that last night 76% of the people of the six communities voted overwhelmingly no to their megacity proposal, they have the smugness and the arrogance basically to laugh it off, disregard it and say it doesn't count.

What we're dealing with here is a government that basically is not a real government, because it has broken its contract with the governed. You cannot govern in a democracy unless you have the consent of the governed. They no longer have that consent in Metropolitan Toronto. They have violated the basic tenets of democracy.

No matter how many speakers have come before them in the hearings who say, "This bill is fundamentally flawed" and "Withdraw it," they still bulldoze ahead. We've had people who have spoken emotionally, philosophically, on a financial basis, on a political basis. The experts have been saying almost unanimously that this bill cannot be supported through independent analyses. Andrew Sancton, Wendell Cox, Paul Pagnuelo, expert after expert, have said that this bill is not sustainable economically, politically or democratically.

1750
They don't listen to them. They don't listen to the people. Seventy-six per cent: this has never happened in

the history of Ontario, where so many people voted in a local plebiscite, overwhelmingly. What does this government do? It laughs it off, ignores it and marches ahead and is going to do it anyway.

This is a government that has basically lost any mandate to dictate to the people of Metropolitan Toronto because this was never in the Common Sense Revolution. In their own pre-election document, the Trimmer report, where Mr Leach was the vice-chairman, they said that they were going to do the opposite, that they were going to strengthen the six local governments. So they have no mandate. They don't have the consent of the governed.

How fundamental can we get in this province? You wonder why people are frustrated, why people are angry, why people are meeting all over this municipality called Metropolitan Toronto, despite the government's attempt to discredit the referendum, to discredit the opposition, despite this government's support by major big media. The Star, the Sun, the Globe and Mail, the editorial boards, the electronic big media, all supported them.

Despite spending millions of dollars on propaganda — every time you turn on the television you have the Premier. Every time you pick up a newspaper, there are editorials, article after article, overkill.

The most disgusting thing I saw through this whole debate, and it has been a debate, is you had 10,000 citizens marching up Yonge Street saying, "Respect our voice," and one of the major propaganda vehicles the government has been using, the Toronto Star, has the gall to put on the front page of the Star, the day after the march, a picture of Roger Clemens and his luxury home in Houston, pushing back to the middle of the paper a small article on the people, joking about the people's march.

That's all people have now because big media, big government is shutting them out. They're showing contempt for their expression of their democratic will. That's all they've done and they get laughed at. They get attacked for doing that.

We heard a comment about the mayor of Toronto because she has a home in Cabbagetown; her taxes are not what they should be. That is what we've come to: Attacking the homes and the taxes they pay. This is what is wrong with this bill and what is wrong with this so-called government. It is no longer a government. This has become an autocratic regime. Simply, that's what it is. When they disregard the election, it's no different than Belgrade; that's what they've done, because the people in Metropolitan Toronto yesterday did what we do in municipal, provincial, federal elections: They voted.

Despite the government's attempt to block the voting, they still voted; despite the attempts of major media to discredit the voting, they voted; despite all the ridicule and all the attacks on the opponents of the megacity, the people voted and they voted overwhelmingly no. They did so because they're disgusted not only with this bill and the mechanics which dismantle local government, but they're disgusted with a government that usurps their right as citizens. That is what Bill 103 does.

The courts have agreed with it. Judge Brennan said the trusteeship was basically a total attack on responsible

government. That's what he said. The Speaker attacked the government for its use of propaganda improperly.

What else do we need than 76% of the people, almost 400,000 people, saying no to this bill, the arrogance of this government. What else will people have to do to get their message across? What will the people have to do if this government continues to laugh, to ridicule, to be arrogant? The Premier didn't even have the guts to go to Scarborough and debate this bill with the other two leaders. He didn't have the respect to go there.

The same government didn't even have the guts to go to the local municipalities and tell them to their faces in their city halls that they were going to be eliminated. They wanted to hide here at Queen's Park because they were afraid to go to the city halls that they were going to be dismantling.

We're dealing with a sneaky, arrogant government that has contempt for all the people of Metro and all of Ontario. I tell the people all over Ontario that if they can do it to us here in Metro, they will do it to you all over Ontario. They'll do it to you in Ottawa and Kingston and Kenora and North Bay and Sudbury, so don't think this is just a Toronto thing. The people of Ontario should be disgusted and appalled, as the citizens of Metro are disgusted and appalled, with the arrogance and the disrespect for democracy this government shows.

Despite what happened yesterday with the vote, they still march forward, saying, "We don't care what you do." I ask the people all over Ontario to stand with us here in Toronto, East York, York, Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough. Don't sit passively by because if they're doing it to us now and you're quiet, they could be doing the same thing to you in your home town in the weeks and months to come. Don't think it's just something that's localized. This is fundamentally anti-democratic; it's autocratic, it's a sledgehammer against democracy, Bill 103, and you should have the intestinal fortitude to vote no against Bill 103 and support this resolution.

The Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.
Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Mr Colle has moved opposition day motion number 3. Is it the wish of the House that the resolution carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. There will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1758 to 1803.

The Acting Speaker: Order. All those in favour, please rise one at a time.

Ayes

Bartolucci, Rick	Gerretsen, John	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Gravelle, Michael	Miclash, Frank
Boyd, Marion	Hampton, Howard	Patten, Richard
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, Elinor	Kennedy, Gerard	Pouliot, Gilles
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Cleary, John C.	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Lankin, Frances	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Marchese, Rosario	Sergio, Mario
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	Silipo, Tony
Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony	Wildman, Bud
Duncan, Dwight	McGuinty, Dalton	Wood, Len

The Acting Speaker: Those opposed, please rise one at a time.

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Harnick, Charles	Pettit, Trevor
Baird, John R.	Harris, Michael D.	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Barrett, Toby	Hastings, John	Ross, Lillian
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Saunderson, William
Boushy, Dave	Johns, Helen	Shea, Derwyn
Carr, Gary	Johnson, David	Sheehan, Frank
Carroll, Jack	Johnson, Ron	Skarica, Toni
Chudleigh, Ted	Jordan, W. Leo	Smith, Bruce
DeFaria, Carl	Kells, Morley	Snobelen, John
Doyle, Ed	Klees, Frank	Spina, Joseph
Ecker, Janet	Leadston, Gary L.	Sterling, Norman W.
Elliott, Brenda	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stewart, R. Gary
Fisher, Barbara	Maves, Bart	Tascona, Joseph N.
Flaherty, Jim	McLean, Allan K.	Tsubouchi, David H.
Ford, Douglas B.	Munro, Julia	Turnbull, David
Fox, Gary	Murdoch, Bill	Vankoughnet, Bill
Froese, Tom	Mushinski, Marilyn	Villeneuve, Noble
Galt, Doug	Newman, Dan	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Gilchrist, Steve	O'Toole, John	Wilson, Jim
Guzzo, Garry J.	Ouellette, Jerry J.	Wood, Bob
Hardeman, Ernie	Parker, John L.	Young, Terence H.

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 36; the nays are 63.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

It being after 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 1807.

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Administration of justice / Administration de la justice

Chair / Président: Gerry Martiniuk
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ron Johnson
Robert Chiarelli, David Christopherson,
Bruce Crozier, Ed Doyle, Garry J. Guzzo,
Tim Hudak, Ron Johnson, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,
Gary L. Leadston, Gerry Martiniuk,
John L. Parker, David Ramsay, David Tilson
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Rick Bartolucci
Toby Barrett, Rick Bartolucci, Gilles Bisson,
Jim Brown, Michael A. Brown, John C. Cleary,
Morley Kells, Gerard Kennedy, Frances Lankin,
Allan K. McLean, E.J. Douglas Rollins, Frank Sheehan,
Bill Vankoughnet, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Finance and economic affairs /
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Ted Chudleigh
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tim Hudak
Isabel Bassett, Jim Brown, Ted Chudleigh,
Joseph Cordiano, Douglas B. Ford, Tim Hudak,
Monte Kwinter, Tony Martin, Gerry Martiniuk,
Gerry Phillips, Gilles Pouliot, E.J. Douglas Rollins,
Joseph Spina, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Bart Maves
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Mike Colle, Harry Danford, Jim Flaherty,
Michael Gravelle, Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese,
Bart Maves, Julia Munro, Lillian Ross,
Mario Sergio, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
Len Wood, Terence H. Young
Clerk / Greffière: Lynn Mellor

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Floyd Laughren
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony Silipo
Rick Bartolucci, Ed Doyle, Douglas B. Ford,
Gary Fox, Michael Gravelle, Bert Johnson,
Peter Kormos, Floyd Laughren, Gary L. Leadston,
Frank Miclash, Dan Newman, Peter L. Preston,
Tony Silipo, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Ted Arnott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John Hastings
Ted Arnott, Dave Boushy, Tony Clement,
Vin Curling, Carl DeFaria, Bill Grimmett,
John Hastings, Ron Johnson, Margaret Marland,
Iles E. Morin, Sandra Papatello, Tony Silipo,
Gary Stewart, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Ombudsman

Chair / Président: John L. Parker
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tom Froese
Carl DeFaria, Barbara Fisher, Tom Froese, Pat Hoy,
W. Leo Jordan, Jean-Marc Lalonde, Rosario Marchese,
Bill Murdoch, John R. O'Toole, John L. Parker,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart, Bill Vankoughnet,
Len Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: Bernard Grandmaître
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Richard Patten
Marcel Beaubien, Dave Boushy, Gary Carr, Brenda Elliott,
Gary Fox, Bernard Grandmaître, John Hastings,
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Shelley Martel, Richard Patten,
Gilles Pouliot, Sandra Papatello, Derwyn Shea, Toni
Skarica
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Smith
Ted Arnott, Toby Barrett, Gilles Bisson, Dave Boushy,
John Gerretsen, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
Gerard Kennedy, Tony Martin, Trevor Pettit,
Lillian Ross, Tony Ruprecht, Frank Sheehan, Bruce Smith
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

**Resources development /
Développement des ressources**

Chair / Président: Brenda Elliott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Barbara Fisher
Dominic Agostino, John R. Baird, David Christopherson,
Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Sean G. Conway,
Brenda Elliott, Barbara Fisher, Doug Galt, Pat Hoy,
Bart Maves, John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette,
Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker

Social development / Affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Annamarie Castrilli
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Dwight Duncan
Marion Boyd, Elinor Caplan, Jack Carroll,
Annamarie Castrilli, Dwight Duncan, Tom Froese,
Helen Johns, W. Leo Jordan, Lyn McLeod,
Julia Munro, Trevor Pettit, Peter L. Preston,
Bruce Smith, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

CONTENTS

Tuesday 4 March 1997

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Northwestern Ontario	
Mr Gravelle	7353
School tour campaign	
Mr Wildman	7353
Jake Termorshuizen	
Mr Preston	7353
Municipal referendum	
Mr Sergio	7353
Ms Churley	7354
Mr Cordiano	7354
Sarnia riding	
Mr Boushy	7354
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Silipo	7354
Elaine Bursztyn	
Mr Tascona	7355

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Municipal restructuring	
Mr Leach	7355
Mr Colle	7356
Mr Hampton	7356

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr McGuinty	7357
Mr Harris	7357, 7365
Mr Hampton	7359, 7365
Mr Leach	7359, 7360, 7361
Mr Silipo	7360
Mr Colle	7361
Education reform	
Mr Wildman	7361
Mr Harris	7361
Court system	
Mr Guzzo	7362
Mr Harnick	7362
Services en français aux hôpitaux	
French-language hospital services	
M. Morin	7362
M. Villeneuve	7362
M. Hampton	7363
Mr Harris	7363
M. Bisson	7363

School boards

Mr Newman	7363
Mr Snobelen	7363

Health Services Restructuring

Commission	
Mr Kennedy	7364
Mr Wilson	7364

PETITIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr Bradley	7365
Mr Curling	7366
Drinking and driving	
Mr Baird	7365
Mr Galt	7366
Mrs Marland	7367
Mr Barrett	7367
Hospital financing	
Mr Miclash	7365
Mrs Pupatello	7366
Mr Jordan	7368
Mr O'Toole	7366
Occupational health and safety	
Mr Christopherson	7366, 7367
Education reform	
Mr Duncan	7367
Fire safety	
Mr Christopherson	7367
Mr Bartolucci	7368
Health care workers	
Mr Cleary	7367

FIRST READINGS

4588 Bathurst Act, 1997	
Bill Pr74, Ms Bassett	
Agreed to	7368
750 Spadina Avenue Association Act, 1997, Bill Pr75, Ms Bassett	
Agreed to	7368

OPPOSITION DAY

Municipal restructuring, opposition	
day motion number 3, Mr Colle	
Mr Colle	7368, 7387
Mr McGuinty	7370
Mr Silipo	7371
Mr Parker	7374
Mr Cordiano	7377
Mr Hastings	7378
Mr Kennedy	7379
Mr Marchese	7380
Mr Ford	7382
Mr Sergio	7383
Mr Gilchrist	7384
Mr Curling	7384
Mr Ruprecht	7385
Mr Hampton	7385
Mr Sterling	7385
The Acting Speaker	7385
Negated	7385

OTHER BUSINESS

Estimates	
The Speaker	735
Visitor	
The Acting Speaker	737

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 4 mars 1997

QUESTIONS ORALES

Services en français aux hôpitaux	
M. Morin	7362
M. Villeneuve	7362
M. Hampton	7363
M. Bisson	7363

CADON
X1
- D23



No. 173

N° 173

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 5 March 1997

Mercredi 5 mars 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 5 March 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 5 mars 1997

*The House met at 1332.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I rise today to present to the House a message from the people of Bruce county. They delivered to my office yesterday copies of letters that they had presented to the Grey-Bruce District Health Council in response to its reckless and insensitive recommendations on the future of health care in their area, these recommendations of course made necessary by the cuts to hospitals of this government.

These letters are coming from people specifically supporting the Bruce hospital in Walkerton. After a general mailing to 9,000 households, the hospital received 7,946 letters in return in support of the hospital and against the restructuring plans of the Grey-Bruce District Health Council. Eighty eight per cent of the residents took time to respond to the restructuring plans. This is an overwhelming show of support and contrary to the actions of the government which made it necessary.

As the House is aware, the Minister of Health has asked the Grey-Bruce District Health Council to postpone his report until he can develop his last-minute rural health policy. We hope the House will recognize that it is these 7,946 people who want the government to draft a policy that will allow them to have quality and complete health care in their home communities.

The people who wrote these letters have a commitment to their hospital that this government cannot afford to ignore. They donate every year to support its activities. They are scared that if their hospital is gone their doctors will also be lost. They know that change is necessary, but these 7,946 people want the government to listen to their concerns.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North): I rise today to give my support to SOS Montfort and to the Franco-Ontarian community in its efforts to save Montfort Hospital.

The recommendations of the Health Services Restructuring Commission appointed by this government do not reflect in any way the fact that Montfort is the only community hospital in the country that offers a full medical training program in French. Doctors are trained to practise in smaller hospitals in urban and rural areas. This is crucial for northern Ontarians, to have French doctors who receive training that really reflects the needs

of our northern communities. This hospital also provides training for 14 other health care specialties. In the last five years, more than 1,000 students have trained at Montfort.

Many of my constituents of Cochrane North have been hospitalized in Montfort for specialized care, and all agree that it is not only reassuring but also crucial to be able to communicate with staff and doctors in their mother tongue. I would also like to stress that 77% of Montfort's clientele is French, and in terms of long-term and psychiatric care, this figure goes as high as 98%.

In the last week the francophone community has been mobilizing its efforts to fully inform the commission, the government and the public of the crucial importance of this institution. I'm urging today the minister of francophone affairs to wake up and do his job and stand up for the Franco-Ontarian community. Stop hiding behind the commission and take action.

I might point out that if it wasn't for Bill 26, which was brought in by Mike Harris and this Conservative government, we wouldn't be seeing hospital closures across this province, especially Montfort Hospital, which is crucial to the people —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Statements?

ATHERLEY BRIDGE

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I'm pleased to rise in the House this afternoon and comment on an important project in my riding of Simcoe East. The project is the twinning of the Atherley Bridge.

The constituents in my riding have shown great concern over the frustrating traffic congestion on the bridge, especially during the peak summer tourist season. The opening of Casino Rama, while it is a wonderful benefit to the area, did add a tremendous load to the already heavy traffic over the bridge at the narrows. This was not properly planned in the previous government's casino approval.

I've personally worked hard and long with the local municipal council and the Ministry of Transportation expressing the importance of the widening of this bridge. Just over a year ago I forwarded a memo to the Ministry of Transportation urging them to act as quickly as possible to correct this situation. With the opening of Casino Rama in July, I knew an explosive situation was about to happen.

I am pleased to see this project is becoming a reality. The Ministry of Transportation has announced they expect the bridge project will be tendered in the next few weeks. Currently the ministry is working on an agreement with the Ontario Casino Corp to fund the three-year

project, which is expected to be in the neighbourhood of \$16 million to \$18 million. This funding will come from the 20% the government collects from casino revenues in Ontario.

Special care will be taken to protect the fish spawning beds located in the area.

I commend the city of Orillia and Ramara for the hard work they have done.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Behind closed doors and in secret, the Harris government is taking a major step backwards in the protection of the environment.

While the attention of the province is riveted on the Toronto amalgamation issue, the municipal downloading and the closing of hospitals, the Harris regime is taking responsibility for the Niagara Escarpment Commission away from the Ministry of Environment, which is there to protect the environment, and giving it to the Ministry of Natural Resources, which has jurisdiction over the exploitation of our natural resources.

The Ministry of Natural Resources has no interest in the protection of our unique escarpment lands. In fact, we can expect to see more gravel pits and all kinds of development on an environmental gem which has been designated by the United Nations as a world biosphere.

Besides placing the Niagara Escarpment Commission under the control of the Ministry of Natural Resources, a ministry with a dreadful record in the field of environmental protection, Premier Harris is removing Norm Sterling, the minister in the Davis government responsible for establishing the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the only minister with a commitment to preserving and protecting Niagara Escarpment lands, from responsibility for this important file.

This is a shameful day for the Conservative government of Mike Harris and a mighty sad day for the environment.

1340

NATIONAL GROCERS

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): Earlier this week, on Monday to be exact, I brought Mary Carlucci to this place to share with us the stress that she's under, incurred by National Grocers as they tried to take away her store. In light of the fact that this is 1997 and Saturday is the day the international community sets apart to recognize the role of women in society, some of her comments are interesting. She says:

"National Grocers also lied to me when they got me into this franchisee arrangement; they told me, 'Don't worry, you will make money in our stores.' I trusted them. I believed what they told me. I quit a job I had with Loeb and brought the National Grocers store from \$9 million a year volume to \$22 million. Now they want the store for their own, just like the Loeb situation. They make me buy products at a high price and sell it at a low price so the store loses money. They also don't want me running one of their stores because I'm a woman. I'm the only one in the entire chain. I was good enough when

they wanted my family name and my experience to build up the store business. Now, after using me, National Grocers thinks they can toss me aside. I've been told I shouldn't be running a store, that I should be at home where I belong. Can you imagine that kind of attitude? I've even been told how to dress by the National Grocers old boys' club. Discrimination? Yes, I think so....

"I even wrote a personal letter to all the board of directors...including its chairman, Galen Weston, and to Mrs Hilary Weston. (I thought she should know what kind of company her husband is operating.)" Today —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Members, thank you. That's improper. Please bring it down. I'm warning you to take it down. The members for Sault Ste Marie and Cochrane North, I'm warning you. Statements?

GLAXO WELLCOME

Mrs Helen Johns (Huron): In an innovative and inclusive process, more than 400 employees of Glaxo Wellcome responded to a survey asking for ideas on where the company should focus its charitable contributions. The majority chose hospice care.

Hospice gives people with life-threatening illnesses the opportunity to be cared for at home surrounded by people they love. The goal of hospice care is to make the final months of life in the home comfortable and peaceful. Volunteers, who are the hands and heart of hospice, provide emotional support, practical help and companionship during times of grief.

Glaxo Wellcome is the largest research-and-development-based pharmaceutical manufacturing firm in Ontario and the second-largest in Canada. Through R&D investments, Glaxo makes significant contributions to the health care of Canadians. In this partnership, they plan to build a model to address the issues affecting Canadian society using the powerful combination of expertise, volunteerism, partnership and funding to make a difference. This kind of initiative, this government supports. This partnership should be a model for other companies who want to make meaningful contributions in the charitable field.

I would like to thank Paul Lucas, the employees and the management of Glaxo, and I would like to thank Janet Napper and the board of Hospice Ontario for their commitment to the patients and families in Ontario.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): This is an open letter to the Minister of Education, Mr Snobelen:

"Last year at this time, we were very concerned about the cancellation of the summer jobs program for youth. So too were students from across Ontario. In fact, in very short order, you heard from student groups across Ontario, begging you not to cancel the programs. Thanks to their efforts, they saved the programs, although you scaled them down severely.

"Minister, one year later, your government's policies have created alarm in a great number of young people across Ontario.

"The unemployment rate for young people is worsening. In fact, the standard rate is 2% higher in Ontario

than in the rest of Canada. You are forcing tuition fees to soar. This is hardly helpful.

"This is not the time to eliminate student summer jobs programs. Unfortunately, I understand that this is exactly what you intend to do. Once again this year it is your intention to scrap the youth jobs programs. Instead you plan to tell young people to go find their own jobs and maybe some companies possibly could, perhaps, be eligible for a \$2-an-hour cheque at the end of the work period.

"Minister, this is not acceptable. For example, non-profit organizations find the Environmental Youth Corps program vital...."

It is just not acceptable.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): I stand here today in order to speak out on behalf of what is going on across this province and how Mike Harris's cuts to government are affecting people in their lives.

Government says over and over again that it wants to cut through red tape. They want to do this in order to make government more efficient for the people of Ontario so we can get business done.

I have a group in my riding which for the last 14 months has tried to get incorporated. The SPCA in Timmins, by Marg Kilgore, has been trying for 14 months to get themselves incorporated. They can't get their application from the bottom of the pile to the top because the government has laid off a majority of the employees within those offices, so the normal processing of simple things like incorporation papers cannot be done in a timely fashion.

Is this common sense? I say it's nonsense. You're supposed to be there and the government is supposed to deliver services to assist businesses and assist individuals to do business in this province. Well, this ain't the case. The government with its cuts is making it more difficult for people to access government, making it increasingly longer for people to work their applications through the system. We have yet another example where in Timmins Marg Kilgore and the SPCA have now waited 14 months to get their thing through, and it's not there.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr W. Leo Jordan (Lanark-Renfrew): Every dollar wasted in the hospital system is a service lost for patients who need care. We spend more than any other jurisdiction in the world, yet Ontario's health care system is not reaching its real potential.

Taxpayers expect nothing less than a hospital system that puts patients first. The restructuring commission will achieve this by removing waste and maximizing the dollars that go to direct patient care. Restructuring is long overdue. In the last 10 or 15 years, 30 district health councils have looked at restructuring 134 hospitals.

My friends in the third party were also familiar with the need for change. They will recall that the Perth hospital exhausted every avenue with that government to obtain funding for a capital project. When I met with the

then minister, the honourable member for Beaches-Woodbine, she agreed that funding would be available if the Perth and Smiths Falls hospitals restructured.

The boards and the DHC and I worked through a restructuring plan that merged two administrations into one. This restructuring was the first for small hospitals in Ontario and has saved over \$4 million to date.

A condition of the merger is that investments would be made in chronic care beds in Smiths Falls, which we are currently addressing with Minister Wilson. I congratulate the officials.

EASTER SEAL SOCIETY

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Community and Social Services): May I have unanimous consent, Mr Speaker, to make a statement regarding Easter Seals today?

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Unanimous consent for a statement on Easter Seals: Agreed? Agreed.

Hon Mrs Ecker: On November 28, 1922, the Ontario Society for Crippled Children, now known as the Easter Seal Society, was created to help raise funds and enable thousands of children with disabilities to receive the help they need regardless of their parents' ability to pay. Over the last 75 years the society has opened its arms to these special children and developed community services and supports to respond to their needs.

It is my pleasure today to congratulate the Easter Seal Society as they celebrate their 75th anniversary. I would also like to introduce two very important guests with us today, the Easter Seal children who will be the ambassadors for all children with disabilities. I am sure all members will join me today in welcoming the 1997 provincial Easter Seal Timmy, T.J. Perry from Oshawa, and also Anna Mejewska, from Brampton, who is the 1997 local Easter Seal Society Tammy.

The Easter Seal Society continues to make a positive difference in the lives of children with physical disabilities and their families by providing a unique and wide range of direct programs and services. These include direct and consultative nursing services to help families care for their children in their homes, schools and communities.

1350

The society provides families with support through educational workshops and information about treatment facilities, clinics and other services that are available. The society also offers financial assistance for medically prescribed equipment, parent relief, summer camps, pre-school programs, transportation and other supports.

Through the Easter Seal Research Institute, the society funds research, development and professional training in the prevention, treatment and management of physical disabilities in children.

Over the last 75 years, the Easter Seal Society has helped these children and their families through fund-raising in the community. March is when the society asks all of us to contribute to this important work; I would encourage us all to do so. I wish the society much success in this year's campaign and much success to this year's Timmy and Tammy.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): We can't tell you, T.J. and Anna, how pleased we are to help say happy 75th anniversary to Easter Seal.

There was a Rotary Club of Windsor president named Arthur Fitzgerald, and in 1922 he made a phone call to a Rotarian he knew in Alleghria, Ohio, and at that time he said: "We really need help here in Ontario. We have young kids we're just not able to help. Let's do something about that."

As a result of one phone call, many Rotarian presidents got together for a remarkable meeting. That meeting happened in Windsor several months later, and that was the founding of the Ontario Crippled Children's Society at that time. Over the years, of course, it's become so well known and represented by that Easter Seal stamp that all of us know so well, and it is in fact the Easter Seal Society of Ontario.

Many communities across Ontario participate in the Easter Seal Walkathon and the Easter Seal Telethon, and that gives all of us an opportunity to meet our local Easter Seal kids. What's most important to people in Ontario is to know that these are extraordinary kids, and we want to help extraordinary kids do very ordinary things.

In Windsor we had Very Special Experiences, just as they've had in Pembroke, one of the best telethons in Ontario, which probably raises the highest per capita of all telethons across the country.

We met a young man named Chris Hornsby. As a result of the funding by Easter Seal, this child from Windsor was able to participate in summer camp; in fact he went several times. The older he got, he used to come home to his parents with pretty remarkable stories for a nine-year-old. At the end of one summer, he came back with an earring, much to his parents' chagrin. The summer after that, he came back with a girlfriend. This certainly shows us that these kids are in fact extraordinary kids doing very ordinary things.

All of the Rotarians, all of the Kiwanis, all of the service organizations, the Knights of Columbus, genuine folk who watch the telethon and claim and call in their pledges, all of them do that to help the Easter Seal Society of Ontario continue in its mandate, and that is: helping extraordinary kids do very ordinary things.

On behalf of all of us in the House, T.J. and Anna, the kids you represent, happy anniversary to the Easter Seal Society of Ontario.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On behalf of the New Democrat caucus, I'm delighted to have this opportunity to welcome T.J. and Anna to be with us this afternoon. It's great to see you here. I want you to say a big hello to all the kids you represent.

It's fun to be part of a celebration, and this is something worth celebrating, 75 years of the Easter Seal Society putting kids first. There's a lot of rhetoric at times in this House about the lofty ideals we all share, and putting kids first is one of them, but here's an organization that does it well, that does it in spades and to whom we all in our communities owe a lot.

The Easter Seal Society makes a really positive contribution to our communities. They make a positive contribution to children and their families by providing a

unique and wide range of services. Some of those services that they operate are a province-wide community nursing program that's so important in providing that individual counselling and help in families' homes; the camp, and you've heard my colleague from Windsor speak about some of the experiences some of the kids she knows have had at the wonderful camp; financial assistance to families to get equipment such as wheelchairs, braces and communications devices, all of those tools that help kids in ordinary functions of life and just make it so much easier to accomplish that; respite care, where trained caregivers can go into the home and give family members a break; integrated preschool programs; transportation assistance, which is really important to get to hospitals and preschools and treatment programs; parent-to-parent links — the northern clinics have a network of parent delegates which is really important in helping to support parents and develop their advocacy skills so they can represent their issues to themselves; research — the minister spoke about the research activities and the advocacy network that has been set up.

Organizations like Easter Seal really try to fill the gaps that governments leave. Governments can't fill all gaps, so we know it's really important work, and of course it's necessary in these days more than it ever has been.

While we are celebrating some 75 years of hard work and dedication in our communities that the Easter Seal Society has provided, I want to pay a special tribute to all the volunteers who make their work a reality. There are more than 240 Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Kinsmen and other service clubs, as well as countless volunteers, over half a million volunteers and donors who help raise the funds that provide these direct services to families, to children, in partnership with Easter Seal, and 86 cents of every dollar that is contributed to the society goes directly to providing those services for kids.

The majority of the money raised for Easter Seal comes from individual donors and corporate sponsored events. Because of their support, the support of the people who give of their time and their financial resources, these kids can look forward to a brighter future which includes full individual potential and greater independence.

There's an opportunity to get involved. While there are half a million volunteers already, we can always use more. It's important work. Individual volunteers can get involved in the society by doing things like chairing a task force or planning committee; providing office support by proofreading publications; participating in group activities like mailings, folding and stuffing envelopes, getting those mailings out, those appeals out.

You can help out on special event committees or on the activities, the days of special events. You can be a "day of" volunteer to help coordinate and be there. You can participate in many events by collecting pledges or by entering a team.

There's a whole list of activities that corporations can do to provide that kind of support that's so necessary, and of course service club partners that are already very active participants in the Easter Seal campaign have a whole range of activities they organize.

You can help. All of us can help. It's such an important contribution that we as individuals and organizations can make, and one I urge all of us to participate in.

I would like to wrap up by reading the mission statement of the Easter Seal Society. It reads as follows:

"We are dedicated to helping children with physical disabilities achieve their full individual potential and future independence. Easter Seal people make a difference in the lives of children and their families by providing direct services, programs, research, advocacy and public education. There is much more to do."

I agree with that. There is much more to do and it is a continuing challenge to all of us — organizations, volunteers and governments — to work together and to try and ensure we are truly meeting the slogan of the Easter Seal Society, "Putting Kids First."

The Speaker: Thank you to the minister, the member for Windsor-Sandwich and the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

To Timmy and Tammy — T.J. and Anna — welcome. I hope you enjoy this period, and I'd be interested in hearing your comments once you've finished watching.

1400

ORAL QUESTIONS

FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):

My first question is for the Minister of Health. I want to come back to the issue of the closing of the Montfort Hospital. This issue, as I'm sure you will now recognize, is of great importance. It's not only about accessible health care, it's about the protection of minority language rights.

To Ontario francophones, this issue strikes at the very heart of their identity and in fact the place they occupy in Ontario society. It's about respect and it's about equality. Surely you can understand and respect why the closure of the Montfort Hospital, the only francophone hospital in Ontario, is seen by our francophone friends as a slap in the face. Will you not at least, here and now, acknowledge the tremendous symbolic importance of the Montfort Hospital for Ontario's French-speaking minority?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I have tremendous respect for the work that's being done at that hospital, but also, in saying that, in no way do we want, and I don't think the honourable member wants, to demean the valuable work and the valuable training that's being done in the French language at other institutions like the Civic, the Royal Ottawa, the heart institute and in other parts of Ottawa-Carleton where they're also providing French-language health services to the people who need them.

Mr McGuinty: I believe the minister, in fairness, is not aware that the Montfort is the only hospital in the province where medical records are kept in French, where francophones can communicate with all their doctors and all their nurses in the French language and where francophone doctors are trained and educated in their own language. There are eight anglophone hospitals in the

province of Quebec. There is one francophone hospital in Ontario and you are now moving to close it.

In closing the Montfort, you're doing more than just shutting down a hospital. You are removing a very real and concrete expression of the respect we hold for our minority group, the francophones. Minister, why is it —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: I don't understand why the honourable member doesn't direct his comments more directly to the people who have cut health care spending in this country, and that's the Liberal Party of Canada, some \$2 billion; second, the honourable member has a lot of nerve when it was his party that cut 700 beds out of Ottawa-Carleton beginning in 1988-89. So you've closed the beds and all the commission — not this government but the commission — is trying to do is to find the administrative savings, merge the programs on to fewer sites and free up dollars for the badly needed health services that the people, including the francophones of Ottawa-Carleton, need.

Mr McGuinty: The minister may not want to hear this, but some things are of greater value to us as Ontarians than simply money. Quality health care, for instance, and protection of rights for our francophone minority are things of that nature. The closure of the Montfort is of national significance. The Prime Minister himself, provincial premiers and political leaders have pleaded with you to intervene on behalf of our francophone minority, not because they want to meddle in our affairs but because they recognize the symbolic importance of this hospital.

Francophones everywhere in Ontario right now are waiting with bated breath for your response. They have no interest in your commission because they understand, as I'm sure you do, that when it comes to the protection of minority rights, that is hardly the responsibility of an unelected commission, but that is clearly the responsibility of this government.

Minister, will you or will you not take this opportunity right now to tell us that you are going to intervene and ensure that Montfort Hospital will not close?

Hon Mr Wilson: The commission in its interim report went to great length, I think, to ensure that French-language services would be in place for the people who need them in that part of the province and in other parts of the province where they've been.

The honourable member knows, and he said in his question, that some people have no interest in the commission. I say with respect that everybody better get interested in the work of the commission, because the law is clear in this province that that commission has the authority to restructure the health services system and to actually create a system because of all the beds and the federal budget cuts that your party's imposed on this province.

They're now going to create a health care system so at the end of the day we have modern hospitals with new technologies, the newest drug therapies, more nurses and more doctors available to cure more people. I would ask that during this period the Montfort Hospital and others direct their concerns, provide their data and evidence to

the commission, which has given this period of time for all of us to direct our concerns to them before they make their final submission.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): In the absence of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, I'll go to the Chair of Management Board, I guess. For the past six weeks, my colleague Gerry Phillips and I have been engaged in a very productive exercise. We have travelled the province, met with community groups and determined what the consequences of the downloading are going to be for Ontario communities. They told us that the number one effect is going to be an increase in property taxes. London Deputy Mayor Hopcroft said property taxes are going to go up by 20%. Timmins Mayor Vic Power said property taxes in that city are going up by 40%. Kingston Mayor Bennett said commercial property taxes are going to go up by 42%. Will you now admit that your government was wrong when it claimed that its policies of downloading will not lead to an increase in property taxes in Ontario?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): I certainly won't admit that. The whole process is one that municipalities have been looking forward to for many years.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): They never asked for social services to be downloaded. Come on.

Hon David Johnson: The previous governments attempted to do this under disentanglement, as the former mayor of Kingston will realize. This government has proceeded to install accountability measures, to clarify which level of government is going to deliver what service. That will make the whole situation more accountable, less expensive, and I believe provide the possibility and the likelihood for municipal property taxes to go down.

Bear in mind that one of the major components and the most expensive service, bar none, is the cost of education, and this government finally, after years and years of requests by municipalities, by people, by businesses across the province, is saying, "Let's take the cost of education at least off the residential component," and that's exactly what we've done.

Mr McGuinty: If everything is going so swimmingly and all is truly well in Camelot, why is there such desperate, mad, frantic scrambling going on behind closed doors inside the Minister of Municipal Affairs' office? They're trying to salvage this botched proposal. There's only one description for this: It's policy on the fly, and policy on the fly always makes for bad policy.

Let me tell you what Terry Cooke, regional chair of Hamilton-Wentworth, said about the downloading: "The disentanglement process is fundamentally flawed. My fear is we will divide this province into a series of communities, some of which have and others which have not."

Not only are we talking about Ontarians paying higher property taxes; they're going to get a province unlike this

one. They're going to get a province where some communities, many communities, will not have the wherewithal to care for their needy.

Minister, the plan is fundamentally flawed. Will you now admit you've downloaded the wrong services?

Hon David Johnson: It's called consultation; what's going on is called consultation. I know it's a word that may be foreign to the opposition parties. It's called consultation.

The head of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Terry Mundell, is integrally involved in the consultation process. Committees have been set up involving the municipalities, involving the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. They are working with the province to make this separation of services work, and they're confident and I'm confident that this will work to the betterment of the people of Ontario. At the end of the day there is only one taxpayer, and what we need to do and what we're working on for that one taxpayer is to separate these services, to make them more accountable and to make them more effective and efficient.

Mr McGuinty: When I was elected leader, I promised that I would not merely criticize but put forward some positive alternatives.

Mr E.J. Douglas Rollins (Quinte): Let's hear them. 1410

Mr McGuinty: I'm coming to that; hang in there. Here's my advice. You've got to go back to the drawing board and bring us a solution that reflects the following four basic principles:

(1) The province must in all instances retain its capacity to care for our needy, especially children and seniors. We cannot devolve that to municipalities.

(2) Any new transfer responsibilities should be, must be, an even swap.

(3) The province should be responsible for soft services like welfare, child care and senior care, and the municipalities for hard services.

(4) Finally, and this is a novel concept to the government, the public must be involved. They've got to be involved in developing changes.

I developed these four principles together with my colleague. We travelled the province. That's based on consultation. Minister, will you tell us today that you're going to bring back new proposals that meet those four principles?

Hon David Johnson: When the leader of the official opposition indicated that he had some advice to offer, I thought perhaps he was going to recommend the commercial concentration tax again. Of course this is the kind of approach that we had from the Liberal government in the 1980s.

This government has ensured that the needs of the elderly and the needy are protected through the new welfare approach, through the approach to long-term care, the integration of the health services at the local level, where those within their communities will realize what services are required for the people who live within those communities.

This government has brought forward a proposal that not only is neutral, but we've brought forward a proposal which through accountability measures, through effi-

ciencies, will involve lower cost to municipalities and lower municipal taxes.

Finally, this is a consultative process —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. New question.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): I wanted to ask this question of the Premier. He's not here. I wanted to ask it of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. He's not here. So I will try —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Could you ask it to the people who are here, leader of the third party?

Mr Hampton: I'll try to ask it of the government House leader. Today I joined my NDP colleagues in welcoming hundreds of people to Queen's Park. They marched from Toronto city hall to officially present you with the referendum results. No one came out to see them. No one came out to talk with them. In fact, you treated them with extreme disrespect and arrogance.

Minister, the people voted against your megacity bill. They didn't say, "Tinker with the bill." They didn't say, "Work on it." They said no to it. They don't want it. When are you going to listen to them? When are you going to listen to the people of Toronto who are trying to give you some helpful advice?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): The government's approach to the referendum on Monday is indeed to listen, and there's no question that there are messages being conveyed through that. This government intends to take its time and get this right. The government is listening to the messages that are conveyed.

I'll tell you some of those messages. Some of those messages are concern about the possibility of tax increases. We believe that certainly won't happen, but there is concern about tax increases. There's concern about the impact on the welfare system. There's concern about communities and the retention of neighbourhood communities, and that communities fear it within Metropolitan Toronto. Those are a few of the concerns that are being expressed. The government is listening to those concerns. The government is going to, in the fullness of time, deal with them and bring forward amendments to address those very concerns.

Mr Hampton: We heard yesterday about the government's plans for amendments. We heard that the government is, in effect, going to introduce amendments into committee of the whole. But the fact is, and the House leader would know this, under the time allocation motion here's only going to be one hour for committee of the whole. In other words, there's going to be no debate, no discussion. You haven't changed anything. You'll introduce a few amendments and then ram it through in an hour.

Minister, don't you get it? People have had it with your arrogance; they've had it with your disrespect for democracy; they've had it with the fact that you don't listen. They're trying to send you a message: "Withdraw Bill 103. Withdraw it." Will you do that?

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order. I want to just quickly caution the gallery. There's no applause, there's no shouting out, there's nothing in the way of a demonstration.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): But you can smile if you want.

The Speaker: The member for Welland-Thorold, I appreciate all your help, and you're as helpful as usual, but I would ask you — it's difficult, I'm sure, as it is.

Hon David Johnson: This government some time ago embarked on a very lengthy, time-consuming process and it was called democracy. The process involved over 100 hours of public hearings. Over 600 people came to advise the government. Then there was the referendum in the various municipalities over this past Monday.

The government, out of respect for that democratic process, is going to listen; it's going to analyse the results. It has heard a number of concerns that have been raised. The government is going to take its time and the government will come forward with an approach to address the many concerns that have been raised through this process. At the end of the day, through the committee of the whole process, we will see amendments to address those concerns.

Mr Hampton: The government House leader says they're listening. Thousands of people marched here today and your government did not even have the sense of decency or respect to go out and meet them. The mayor of Toronto was here, the mayor of East York was here, the mayor of Scarborough was here, several city councillors were here, and you didn't even have the respect to go out and meet them and talk to them. So how can you say you're listening to anybody?

The gig is up. You're moving according to the same schedule you were moving on before, exactly the same schedule. You want the House to come back in the first week of April and you want no more than one hour of debate in committee of the whole and third reading of your so-called amendments. That's not listening, that's not consultation and that's not showing respect for democracy.

We gave you a proposal yesterday that allows you to go back to the drawing board and begin a real consultation process: Scrap Bill 103. Go back to the drawing board. Start talking to people. Will you do that and show some respect for democracy?

Hon David Johnson: This government has talked to people and is listening to people. This government has just gone through a process where over 600 people have had the opportunity. I wonder how many bills brought forward by the previous government had the opportunity of over 100 hours of public participation. How many bills from the previous government had over 600 deputations to speak to —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Minister.

Hon David Johnson: The message delivered today was received by the Premier's office. The Premier himself has indicated that we need to take our time and to get this right. This was one of the messages, I may say, by the mayor of the city of Toronto: "Take your time. Get it right." That's what we intend to do. We have listened to the people through the public hearings; we

have listened to the results of the referendum. We're going to analyse that, take our time, bring forward the amendments, address the concerns and get it right.

The Speaker: New question; leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: We know what this government's version of consultation is. It's to look in the mirror and say, "Mirror, mirror on the wall."

1420

HOSPITAL STAFF

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My next question is to the Minister of Health. On the eve of your Metro hospital closure announcement, you need to know the current state of patient care in hospitals. On Monday at the Hospital for Sick Children, seven children were turned away from their scheduled appointments for cancer chemotherapy — seven children in one day.

Catherine Gordon's 10-month-old son Paul is one of those children suffering from cancer who was turned away. Why were Paul and six other children suffering from cancer turned away? The hospital admitted it was because there weren't enough nurses that day. The hospital's official line is, "There is no staffing problem," but they admit that if children get sick in clusters, if a couple of nurses are off sick, if there are several emergencies in one day, they can't meet the situation.

Catherine Gordon wants to know, what are you going to do to ensure that those seven children receive the —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I appreciate the question from the honourable member. I think the examples he's raising speak volumes for the need to restructure. These are today's problems that need to be solved because we need every dollar into front-line services.

We spend enough money on health care. The leader of the Liberal Party has said that many times. The federal government has said that. We spend 6% more on health care per person in this province than any other jurisdiction in Canada, than any other province. But we need to better target that money to more nurses, more services and modern hospitals. That's what restructuring is all about and that's the road we're on, to improve those services. We'd expect you to be constructive during this period to help hospitals to beef up their services and get rid of their administration and their excessive overhead and duplication and put every dollar into the patients, because it's the patients we have to focus on.

Mr Hampton: The minister thinks he'll just repeat that bunk and people will believe it. The fact of the matter is, you've taken \$800 million over the last two years out of hospital budgets. That's why hospitals are laying off nurses. That's why when children go to get cancer therapy they can't get it, because there aren't enough nurses there to provide it every day.

We raised with your predecessor a couple of weeks ago —

Interjections.

Mr Hampton: I know the Conservative bench doesn't want to hear about this.

We raised with your predecessor a couple of weeks ago that because of your hospital budget cuts in many

hospitals across the province, registered nurses and registered nursing assistants are being laid off while other hospital staff are being asked to take over their duties with minimal training.

At Matthews Memorial Hospital at Richards Landing near Sault Ste Marie, where the emergency services of the rural hospital are being severely cut back, there was a suggestion to the hospital board that housekeeping staff should be used for medical emergencies; in other words, that cleaners should down their mops and give CPR.

The Speaker: Thank you, leader. Minister?

Hon Mr Wilson: As you know, the government doesn't own the hospitals. The 209 hospitals in the province are owned by their community boards. Those community boards have quality councils that monitor the quality of the health care being delivered by those hospitals, including nurses on those boards. This matter would be a matter of first dealing with the hospital. If you are suggesting the government go further, I'd like to hear that suggestion, but we would expect your backing if you'd suggest the government go further than to bring the matter to the board and make sure they have appropriate staffing in their hospitals.

Again, we are trying to clean up the mess created by the inaction of the previous governments, and yes, we need more services for people. The population is growing older and it's growing and we need to drive every dollar to patient services. That's what we're doing.

Mr Hampton: The problem at Matthews Memorial Hospital is this minister has already affected them. He's already put them through a restructuring and then cut their budget such that they don't have the nursing staff they need. But let me take the problem a bit further.

Because you are closing hospitals and because you are not providing the community services up front, what in effect is happening is that patients across the province are having to carry the load. I'll give you a typical result: Here is Margot Grabarger. She called our office. She reports that in order to stay alive, she needs to spend \$28 for nasal pillows. These used to be provided at a hospital but she gets put out of the hospital and she has to pay the \$28 for these nasal pillows. Then there's \$95 out of her pocket for this humidification chamber. That would have been provided in the hospital but you cut that and she's forced out of the hospital. She's on home care and she has to buy it herself. Then there's this filter for \$27 that she has to buy. What's clear here is this: You go around the province and tell people you're saving money. What you're doing is throwing people —

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon Mr Wilson: It is absolutely ridiculous to suggest that we're saving money from hospitals, absolutely ridiculous, when the member knows that the health care budget is up from \$17.4 billion to over \$17.7 billion. The honourable member knows full well that we've seen no more in savings of \$300 million from hospitals. This year alone we forgave, in one-time accounting changes —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Wilson: We've reinvested close to \$1 billion into health care, three times more than we've seen in any savings that we've tried to achieve in working with our

hospital partners. All of that is out in the public. Today we have better dialysis services and ambulance services and home care services as a result of those reinvestments, and more to come. Included in our reinvestments is the addition of 377 new drugs, free drugs, on the seniors and social assistance formulary, and that's contrary to the 250 drugs —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. New question; official opposition; member for York South.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I think the public watching must be wondering, what is it going to take —

The Speaker: Your question, sir; is it to the Minister of Health? Thank you.

1430

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): The public must be wondering, what will it take for this minister to show an ounce of accountability or responsibility for the health care system that's now back again under his watch? We have some clues from the Premier's statement today to the media, where he likened the nurses losing jobs in hospitals to hula-hoop workers who lost their jobs in factories.

Minister, I'm going to ask you to respond today to somebody much more credible on health care than the person just mentioned, someone who is one of the top cardiologists, Dr Bernard Goldman, the chair of the Association of Cardiac Surgeons of Ontario. To the minister he says that \$2.5-million Band-Aid he put up, as much as it was welcomed, represents a degree of political opportunism.

Minister, will you do what this doctor asks? There is a need to have long-term, realistic commitments from the minister.

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I remind the honourable member that our historic reinvestment of \$170 million into home care which began last year creates 4,400 new jobs for nurses and other front-line providers as we go through this transition period. That's historic and something we should be very proud of.

When we made the announcement last week about another \$2.5 million, which builds on our unprecedented level of funding of \$16 million last year and a 20% increase in cardiac surgeries, I said we would be coming out very shortly — and people have been working at it for the past several months, along with the Cardiac Care Network and ministry officials — with a comprehensive plan for cardiac care in the province. I expect to make that announcement in the very near future.

Mr Kennedy: Minister, you will start being a tiny bit credible when you put a date behind that intention.

You need to understand that the Rykene family suffered because of your cuts. You have cut hospitals such that Leie Rykene died February 11 after five days of waiting for a bed for an angiogram so that she might benefit from some of the money you announced.

Today I got a copy of a letter sent to your predecessor on January 13 from a cardiologist, Dr David Fell, and he says it's the cuts, Minister, your cuts signed for on your desk to Toronto Hospital and a 30% cut in the heart

catheterization lab budget, which are jeopardizing cardiac patients in this province. Now, stand in your place and speak to the people of this province who need those cardiac services and tell them you'll stop the cuts to hospitals and you'll take responsibility as the Minister of Health and you won't hide behind anyone else.

Hon Mr Wilson: Again the honourable member has his facts wrong. Since this government came to office cardiac programs in all of our hospitals are protected programs. They've not been cut one penny. We added \$16 million last year. We added \$2.5 million. What is happening, if the honourable member would like to get into contemporary health care, is that the population is growing faster and older than anyone predicted, including Dr Gold, including all the good folks at the Cardiac Care Network.

We will very shortly announce Ontario's first comprehensive plan for cardiac care, because I agree with the honourable member and some of the experts in the field that government can't keep playing catchup to the population, that we have to get ahead in terms of our funding and our programming, as we've done on dialysis and other projects that we've tackled. By God, we're going to bring in a cardiac program that nips this problem once and for all in the bud and gives us absolute world-class heart care in this province.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT COMMISSION

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of Environment and Energy. The minister will know that the Niagara Escarpment is a unique treasure of Ontario's environment. We are all proud of the work that has been done by governments of all three parties to preserve and to protect the escarpment. It has been recognized by the United Nations as a world biosphere reserve.

Now your government, the Harris government, has decided to give responsibility for the escarpment to the Ministry of Natural Resources, a ministry that's been busy privatizing all of its environmental responsibilities. Environmentalists across the province are outraged. Minister, how can you defend this decision to remove responsibility for the Niagara Escarpment from the Ministry of Environment? How can you defend that?

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): As the Niagara Escarpment Commission is now a responsibility of the Minister of Natural Resources, I will refer the question to him.

Hon Chris Hodgson (Minister of Natural Resources, Northern Development and Mines): In reference to your answer, this was an internal change on government administration when we announced Lands for Life last week as a process to protect nature's best. It's the role of the MNR to protect nature's best. The Niagara Escarpment, as you've mentioned, is a world-class biosphere that's been recognized by the United Nations and we're going to be consulting on how to protect this in a more permanent fashion. The commission will be kept, the act will be kept; there will be no changes to that. I'll be happy to meet with any of you —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Hold on. Supplementary.

Mr Hampton: I think we know what's going on here. The announcement was barely made and the king of severances on the Niagara Escarpment, the member for Grey-Owen Sound, was over asking the minister for a round of severances.

The reality is that you're the Minister of Natural Resources who has already given the aggregate producers basically free rein in terms of opening new gravel pits and new aggregate bases. You're the minister who has already privatized most of MNR's other environmental responsibilities. This is a tragic day for anyone who cares about the environment. It's a tragic day especially for the member for Carleton. Creation of the Niagara Escarpment Commission was an excellent achievement for Ontario.

Are you going to guarantee for us that the Niagara Escarpment Commission is going to continue? Are you going to guarantee for us that the Niagara Escarpment is going to be protected now as it has been in the past? Are you going to give us those guarantees?

Hon Mr Hodgson: I'm not sure it's appropriate that he malign the character of the fine, upstanding MPP from Grey-Owen Sound and my parliamentary assistant for Northern Development and Mines. For the MNR, with Lands for Life, we're going to protect nature's best.

Yes and yes is the answer to your two questions. Is the commission going to remain in place? Yes. Is protection going to be continued? Yes. In fact, I think we can make it better. That's the role of the MNR: to balance the interests of resource users with protecting what is nature's best.

Last week's announcement on Lands for Life, which is a process to protect nature's best, was endorsed by the World Wildlife Fund, the Wildlands League and the Federation of Ontario Naturalists. To quote from the World Wildlife Fund, Monte Hummel: "Though Ontario was in the lead nationally in 1989, its performance has faltered since then." I wonder who the Minister of Natural Resources was during those years? I wonder who the government was when we took a leadership position and faltered —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. New question.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Mr Jim Brown (Scarborough West): My question is to the Attorney General. Minister, a little over a year ago Christie Christie was brutally murdered by shotgun-wielding young offenders. One of the suspects was a 12-year-old. After being shot, Christie lived for two and a half hours. Her wounds were so severe that her mother knew she would die. Christie's dying wish was for her mother to look after her younger brother.

Ishmael Spence had his throat cut at the Kennedy Road subway station a year ago by a young offender.

I know you recently talked to federal Liberal Justice Minister Allan Rock about the Young Offenders Act. Tracey Christie, the Spence family and many more of my constituents are waiting for action on the Young Offenders Act. Would you please tell the House what Mr Rock said he plans to do about the YOA?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I had discussions with the federal minister last week and I advised him that Ontarians are fed up with legislation that protects young offenders from the consequences of their actions.

I've urged the federal minister to lower the age to 15 from 17. I've urged him that if he doesn't want to lower the age, at least to rationalize the transfer provisions. I've said to the minister that the criminal justice system has to have a role when an offender is younger than 12, that the criminal justice system can't be left out. I've urged the minister to allow publication of names of young offenders and I've urged him to permit legal aid only in situations where young offenders' parents can't afford to provide counsel to a young offender.

1440

Mr Jim Brown: Minister, what more can I tell my constituents about the Young Offenders Act? Some 65% of young offenders are repeat offenders, and federal Justice Minister Rock has done nothing. Louis Ambus was murdered by two young offenders nearly two years ago. What can I tell his mother and his family?

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Members for Kingston and The Islands, Scarborough North and Hamilton Centre, please come to order.

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton North): I take it they support the Young Offenders Act.

The Speaker: Member for Halton North, I don't really need your help right now.

Hon Mr Harnick: There is absolutely no doubt about it that young offenders treat the Young Offenders Act as a joke, and the reason they treat it as a joke is because it doesn't provide any sense of deterrence.

The Liberal government in Ottawa isn't helping matters any. They've cut funding to the youth justice system in Ontario by \$200 million since 1989, and instead of getting tough on young offenders, they're asking us to end a system that can jail young offenders who commit serious, violent crimes.

Quite simply, I think we have to have a new look at the Young Offenders Act. Tinkering won't do. The public tells us that, and I hope the federal —

The Speaker: New question, the official opposition.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): My question is to the Minister of Health. Last week your health restructuring commission rolled into town and imposed a conveyor-belt health care program on the residents of Ottawa-Carleton, a set flow of patient traffic that will be in and out of hospital doors.

Your commission, in determining the number of beds required, got rid of acute care beds occupied by patients awaiting more appropriate placement. The alternative level of care indicator is assumed to be zero — absolutely incredible.

You're taking away any flexibility in the system to deal with fluctuations in the need for beds caused by any extraordinary medical disaster. In short, you're underservicing the health care needs of Ottawa-Carleton and you're instituting conveyor-belt health care.

Minister, will you direct your commission to go back to the drawing board, use reasonable assumptions about the required number of beds, and instruct them to use a scalpel and not a meat cleaver?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): If the honourable member feels the commission has some of its data wrong or some of its assumptions wrong, he must bring that to the attention of the commission. That's what this period of time is for and I'd urge the member to do that. The commission I don't think pretends to be perfect, and the chair of the commission, Dr Duncan Sinclair, has said on many occasions that he wants to hear if they did get some of the data wrong, particularly with the ALC mention you just made.

Mr Patten: Minister, according to Bill 26 you have the ultimate responsibility for these decisions, but your restructuring commission performed elective surgery on the Ottawa hospital community instead of improving the quality of care. The recommendations have placed Ottawa's health care community into critical care.

Ottawa, as you well know, has the lowest rate of hospital beds for its population in all of the western world, and Ottawa-Carleton is well below the Ontario average. This is largely due to good utilization of management practices. Ottawa-Carleton at the moment has a hospital acute care utilization rate of 551 patient-days per 1,000. The district health council expected that this could decline to 506 by the year 2000, but your restructuring commission is forcing a targeted rate of 416 patient-days by the year 2003.

The commission, fuelled by the \$1.3-billion cuts, of course, went too far. You're forcing people to move out of hospitals quicker and sicker, and according to the physicians I've talked to, hospitals will be discharging people who haven't recovered and rested fully from surgery and other medical treatment.

I ask you again: Will you instruct the commission to go back to the drawing board and —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Minister of Health.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Ottawa Centre, when I stand, that means you have to sit.

Hon Mr Wilson: The commission's targets and time frame on the surface don't appear to be unreasonable. You've mentioned yourself the year 2003. Nobody is moving tomorrow. It's a substantial time frame to adjust, and we already have hospitals in this province that are below those benchmarks, so we already have hundreds of hospital beds in this province that are operating efficiently, and we don't recognize the fact that some parts of the province have already undergone restructuring and have achieved those targets. Quality improved, surgeries went up, and that has been the experience in other jurisdictions. When you get rid of the overlap and duplication, the excessive administration and the waste in the system, you have dollars to make sure you have more services.

Throughout this whole process, the quality councils of the hospitals are in place — we announced last year a quality council in association with the Institute of Clinical Evaluative Sciences — to ensure that quality is maintained and indeed enhanced. That is the motivating factor

behind the commission, and that will guide all of the decisions taken by the commission over this next period of time.

The Speaker: New question.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): My question is also for the Minister of Health. You have tried to calm the waters with your calm assurances that everything is going to be all right, but we have real concerns about what will happen as these restructuring plans go through. Your commission was going to announce tomorrow its plans for Metro Toronto, and we know already that those plans will include the closure of some chronic care beds and possibly entire chronic care hospitals.

The problem, and it's a real problem, is already here in Metro Toronto, because you have a list here of over 4,500 patients waiting for long-term accommodation, and that list grows by 210 patients every month, because 550 patients are requiring placement and only 340 can be placed. Those figures are according to the placement and coordination services for Metro Toronto. The list is already out of hand because Metro hasn't seen any of the long-term dollars that you trot out every time we talk about this concern.

When this announcement is made tomorrow, will you —

The Speaker: Thank you very much. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: Again, a lot of nerve, coming from someone who was in government for five years, that's the NDP — and the Liberals in 1988-89 froze nursing homes and homes for the aged beds. Not one was added during your entire five years, and now you get up and wonder about the waiting list.

We're going to add beds. Recommendations will be coming forward from the commission to add beds, and as we've followed up in Thunder Bay and as we're following up in Sudbury and as we will follow up in Ottawa and London, we will make the reinvestments to ensure that new beds are added to the system. That's our commitment. We will live up to that commitment as we've lived up to all of our commitments since forming the government.

Mrs Boyd: You can do the math and I can do the math. At 310 additional needed beds per month, we can count back the months. You know the problem started in a big way in Metro Toronto while you were Minister of Health, and you are making it worse with this restructuring committee, because you will be closing wards and closing chronic care hospitals. What you never take into account is the anguish that is caused to those 4,500 patients and their families while they wait for these promises to come true.

All we're saying to you is the reason you are facing so much hostility is that you don't seem to understand the human cost for people who are waiting now, who are being thrown out of hospitals now, because of the change in policy that has been put in place by your government. What we're asking for is not that you wait, not that you make these golden promises, but that when people know their hospital is going to close, they will know they or their loved one has somewhere to go. That's what we're asking.

Hon Mr Wilson: We monitor very carefully the need for new beds, and we'll be reinvesting dollars. So that everyone doesn't panic, the large number that's used, over half those people are already in facilities. They're waiting for placement in more appropriate facilities, which is what restructuring is all about. Fifty-six per cent of the people on that waiting list are currently in a bed but they're in the wrong bed. They're waiting for a more appropriate placement for long-term care and for the programs that go with long-term care in our nursing homes and homes for the aged, and we'll be doing that.

I don't need any lectures from the honourable member from the NDP, whose only legacy in health care and only legacy in government was to leave a \$50-billion debt and no new beds. That is something we must never repeat for our children and grandchildren. You doubled the province's debt and you don't have one new nursing home bed to show for it. Our record will be far better than that because we're already reinvesting money in patients and we're going to open beds in this province.

1450

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): My question is to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation. The opposition delights in confusing the public with talk that your ministry will eliminate the Ontario Human Rights Commission. We heard some of that last week again. In response to the tabling of the ABC task force, the leader of the third party said the government was poised to eliminate the Human Rights Commission.

Minister, my constituents are concerned about these rumours. Can you please tell the House today what this government's position on this issue really is and what your plans are with regard to the Ontario Human Rights Commission?

Hon Marilyn Mushinski (Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation): I'd like to thank the honourable member for his question. I think it's pretty typical that the NDP, unless we're finding new ways and creating ways of spending taxpayers' money, thinks we're going to eliminate everything. I've said repeatedly that throwing more money at the Ontario Human Rights Commission won't solve the problems at the commission. Unlike previous governments which spent money any way they liked, we're more interested in improving the overall effectiveness of the commission.

The reason for the reform is simple: Discrimination in this province is against the law and the Human Rights Commission is the primary body to respond to those issues. That's why this government is moving on its plan of restructuring and reform. Justice delayed is justice denied. They didn't do anything about it. We are.

Mr Martiniuk: Thank you, Madam Minister, for that response. Could you also update the House and my constituents on some of the reforms that have taken place to date and the result of those reforms?

Hon Ms Mushinski: It's a pleasure to report for the first time in recent memory, certainly in the last 10 years, that the commission is closing as many cases as it opens in a year, and that means for the first time in years the

backlog of cases will actually get smaller. We can see that in the case of numbers, the average time a person now has to wait for their case to be resolved has decreased from 22 months, when they spent millions of dollars to increase it in 1992, to 16 months in 1996. Clearly the reforms that are taking place are working for the citizens and the taxpayers of Ontario.

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): My question is to the Minister of Labour, and it concerns the Goldcorp strike in my riding which is now in its ninth month. Minister, as you're aware, negotiations between the management and the union have broken off and no end to the strike seems to be in sight for both the families and the community of this area.

Let me read from a local newspaper article on what effect the strike is having on these workers and their families. "'You are scared, you're really worried and you're not yourself,' one couple recently told the media." Because of this strike we have workers who have had to relocate to other mines, resulting in separation of dad from his family. Parents for the first time ever are feeling they are unable to take care of their families.

Minister, you are condoning by your inaction what Goldcorp is doing to these families and this community. Why are you doing this?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Labour): The situation at Goldcorp unfortunately is one that has been ongoing now for a long time, since June 1996. I actually had an opportunity last week to communicate with some people in the local community. I know there certainly is a desire on behalf of individuals to see this issue resolved as quickly as possible. Although we've made attempts to help out with mediation, unfortunately at the present time there isn't a new agreement and there is no conclusion to the resolution. We have certainly made the mediation services available to both sides.

Mr Miclash: Let me continue reading from this recent article: "Another wife hates watching her husband and his co-workers walk the line while there are scabs on the property. It just doesn't seem right to her. Another father of four worries that his kids feel the stress and tension of being on strike."

Minister, your government's replacement worker legislation is a large part of the cause of the continuation of this strike. I ask you again, will you commit today to make whatever resources are necessary available to encourage or in essence demand that Goldcorp return to the table and bargain in good faith? Will you do this today?

Hon Mrs Witmer: I indicate once again to the member opposite that certainly we have made all of the services of our ministry available to the parties. I also indicate to you that last week I was in communication with people in the community, and we are endeavouring to do whatever we can to bring the entire issue to a resolution. We desire as much as you do that this particular problem can be resolved, because we know that unfortunately there is an impact on the community. I will certainly commit to you personally that if there is anything additional that we can do, we are quite prepared to do that.

ONTARIO RANGER PROGRAM

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. For the last 52 years the Ontario government has supported the Ontario Ranger program. This program run by your ministry has provided thousands and thousands of young people with a valuable outdoor summer experience, and in return these students have provided a valuable public service for minimum wage.

Last week we confirmed with your staff that there are no assurances this program will be funded and that application forms have not gone out to high schools, even though by now your ministry staff should be selecting the applicants. Minister, are you going to fund the Ontario Ranger program? Yes or no?

Hon Chris Hodgson (Minister of Natural Resources, Northern Development and Mines): The honourable member is aware that at this time of year every department in the government reviews their programs and takes forward what they think are the priorities in their ministry. These are times when we have to balance the budget, we have to live within fiscal constraints.

We realize the importance of Junior Rangers, but there are tough decisions that have to be made. There has been no final decision made on the future of Junior Rangers. However, I don't seem to recall the member's protest when she was in a cabinet that in 1992 reduced the program's participation from 900 to 438 17-year-olds and closed 14 Junior Ranger camps in this province. If she did stand up and make public pronouncements that this was devastating and, for all the reasons she stated, bad public policy, I don't seem to recall it. If she wants to clarify that record, I'd be glad to hear it.

Ms Martel: Minister, the real rate of youth unemployment in this province is higher than ever before, and your only answer is to cut the very programs the government has put in place to try to provide jobs to youth.

When I was minister at the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, I put in place a youth unemployment program called Nortop. Nortop is a cost-sharing program with employers in the public and private sectors, a program which is now under review by your ministry, Minister. Some 3,000 students had a job because of the Nortop program last summer. There is no assurance that this program will continue. Are you going to fund Nortop. Yes or no?

Hon Mr Hodgson: I didn't hear an answer to the question when their government reduced the program by 14 camps and from 900 17-year-olds to 438. Did you protest? No. There might be more effective ways to deliver youth programs than having a 24-hour-a-day camp environment.

With regard to Nortop, when she was minister, yes, they did fund programs. Last year, though, when our government was in, we had more youth jobs through Nortop than at any time in your government's mandate, and our record stands for itself. She knows full well that these discussions are evaluated at budget time and there will be announcements following. Again, I know that last year I didn't see her press announcement congratulating the Harris government on a record number of youth

employment opportunities through Nortop. Thank you. That's it.

1500

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Point of order, member for London Centre.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): Mr Speaker, I wrote to you earlier today to tell you that I would be raising a point of order on standing order 97 regarding written questions.

It's my belief that there has been a serious breach of the standing orders and I felt I should bring it to your attention. The standing orders are very clear about written questions. All members have a right to submit them and ministers must respond within 14 days. Of course, ministers routinely miss the deadline and members have a right to bring that to the attention of the assembly, as I have done in cases where the minister's response was many months overdue.

The standing orders also state that the minister must inform the member of cases in which more time is required or, I am quoting here, "that the minister has declined to answer," as the case may be. That's standing order 97(d).

I have sent you three representative sample responses of questions that I raised with the Attorney General, and those are order paper questions 819, 820 and 826. I would stress these are representative sample answers only. I know that it is not your position as the Speaker to talk about the veracity or the legitimacy of answers to questions, so I want you to be very clear. I am not asking you to comment on either the veracity or the legitimacy of the answers that I was provided by the Attorney General.

What I am asking you to determine is whether the responses I have received from the Attorney General in fact constitute answers as contemplated by standing order 97. The Attorney General, if he does not wish to answer a question, can decline to do so, but to send along supposed answers to questions which read like the tape recording of this government's message as opposed to an answer to a specific question is not appropriate. The minister should be on the record as declining to answer the question, not giving a lot of pap around the question without any answer to the question.

I will read only the shortest one of these so that people understand what I'm talking about, and that is order paper question 826. I asked the Attorney General, "Would the Attorney General provide the number of judicial positions and the number of judicial vacancies for December 1993, December 1994, December 1995 and December 1996."

I asked this question on January 28 and this is the answer that I got last week:

"The Attorney General has made eight appointments to the Ontario Court (Provincial Division). The Attorney General, in consultation with the Chief Judge of the Ontario Court (Provincial Division), has been making appointments to fill vacancies for those positions that have been identified by the Chief Judge as being a

priority. The minister will continue to work with the Chief Judge to ensure that Ontario has a sufficient judicial complement."

Mr Speaker, this is not an answer to my question, which asks for simple figures: the number of judicial appointees and the number of vacancies.

The Speaker: To the member for London Centre, firstly, I'd like to thank you for sending me the letter today. It was most appreciated. It also allows me to rule, obviously, the day you submit your point of order.

Having heard your point of order in writing and now orally, and I've checked the standing orders, it appears to me there is nothing in the standing orders that compels the Speaker to measure responses. Measuring responses is a decision that this House would take or the Attorney General would take. I can't measure the written questions nor can I measure the responses.

I might add the answers are truly bizarre but it isn't my decision as to whether they're applicable to the question that was placed. I would suggest possibly that maybe the Attorney General may want to review these on his own time. I can't do that for you. So your point of order is not in order other than to simply say it's curious, your responses. I can't explain it and I don't really expect you to understand it and all I can suggest is maybe the Attorney General would like to take this up with you.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Just to respond to you about the Minister reviewing the answers, he signed the answers.

The Speaker: With all due respect, there's no response, the ruling's been made and I appreciate your point of order.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): I believe we have unanimous consent with regard to the schedule of committee hearings over the next few weeks.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Government House leader, I think you need consent before you go ahead. Agreed to consent? Agreed.

Hon David Johnson: I move that the following committees be authorized to meet during the weeks of March 17, March 24, April 7 and April 14, 1997, in accordance with the schedule of meeting dates agreed to by the three party whips and tabled with the Clerk of the assembly to examine and inquire into the following matters:

The standing committee on administration of justice to consider Bill 84, An Act to promote Fire Prevention and Public Safety in Ontario and to amend and repeal certain other Acts relating to Fire Services, and Bill 105, An Act to renew the partnership between the province, municipalities and the police and to enhance community safety;

The standing committee on finance and economic affairs to consider matters related to pre-budget consultation, and Bill 106, An Act respecting the financing of local government;

The standing committee on general government to consider Bill 109, An Act to amend the Public Libraries Act to put authority, responsibility and accountability for providing and effectively managing local library services at the local level;

The standing committee on government agencies to review intended appointments to the public sector;

The standing committee on resources development to consider Bill 98, An Act to promote job creation and increased municipal accountability while providing for the recovery of development costs related to new growth, and Bill 107, An Act to enact the Municipal Water and Sewage Transfer Act, 1997 and to amend other acts with respect to water and sewage.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

PETITIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I have another petition addressed to the Legislature.

"Whereas 'bigger government is not better' and the Mike Harris government has no right to dictate a megacity upon the citizens of Metro Toronto;

"Whereas the megacity is being imposed on 2.3 million citizens in Metro Toronto without giving people a voice in the future of their cities and neighbourhoods;

"Whereas a megacity could lead to mega property tax increases, mega user fees and mega cuts in services;

"Whereas the Tories never proposed abolishing local government in favour of bigger government during the election campaign;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To give the 2.3 million people in Metro Toronto a say in the future of their cities and stop the imposition of a megacity."

I will support it by adding my signature to this.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North): I'd like to present a petition from the staff of l'école Cité des Jeunes de Kapuskasing, which reads as follows:

«Nous, soussignés, demandons au gouvernement de reconsidérer sa décision de fermer le seul hôpital francophone de l'Ontario, l'hôpital Montfort, et appuyons les efforts du personnel et de l'équipe SOS Montfort.»

This petition is signed by 43 residents of Kapuskasing, Opatatika, Moonbeam, Harty, and I've signed this petition as well and support it.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Tom Froese (St Catharines-Brock): I have a petition that reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine

the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

Signed by a number of people in St Catharines.

1510

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX

M. Gilles E. Morin (Carleton-Est) : «À l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

«Attendu que la recommandation de la commission de restructuration des soins de santé en Ontario ordonne la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort et que cette décision constitue le rejet de la volonté de l'entière communauté francophone de la province et de la communauté de l'est ;

«Attendu que 40 % des francophones de la province de l'Ontario résident dans l'aire de service de l'hôpital Montfort, soit à l'est de l'Ontario, où la population connaît un des plus hauts taux de croissance dans toute la province, que le comté de Russell n'a pas d'hôpital et qu'en plus, Montfort dessert le nord de l'Ontario, où le nombre de francophones est très élevé ;

«Attendu que la fermeture de Montfort éloigne et diminue grandement l'accessibilité à une salle d'urgences pour plus de 150,000 personnes ;

«Attendu que Montfort est le seul hôpital d'enseignement et de formation des professionnels de la santé en français en Ontario et que la fermeture du seul hôpital spécialisé, offrant une gamme complète de services en français, mènera à la dilution et, éventuellement, à la disparition des services de santé en français en Ontario ;

«Attendu que l'on fait disparaître l'hôpital qui a un des meilleurs rendements de la province et qui, pour fins de comparaison, constitue l'exemple de choix du ministère de la Santé ;

«Nous, soussignés, adressons à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario la pétition suivante :

«Nous demandons que le premier ministre de la province intervienne auprès de la Commission de restructuration des services de santé de l'Ontario afin que soit préservé l'emplacement actuel de l'hôpital et que soient consolidés la vocation, le mandat et le rôle essentiel que joue Montfort auprès de sa communauté.»

Il me fait énormément plaisir d'y apposer ma signature.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have a petition sent to me by Shannon Dobson, who is a member of a health and safety committee in the community of Harrow. The petition is signed by many citizens of that community and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Harris government has begun a process to open the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario; and

"Whereas this act is the single most important piece of legislation for working people since it is designed to protect our lives, safety and health while at work and allow us to return home to our families in the same condition in which we left; and

"Whereas the government has made it clear that they intend to water down the act and weaken the rights of workers under the law, including the right to know, the right to participate and especially the right to refuse unsafe work; and

"Whereas this government has already watered down proper training of certified committee members;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario not to alter the Occupational Health and Safety Act or erode the rights of workers any further and ensure strict enforcement of the legislation."

I proudly add my name to theirs.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr E.J. Douglas Rollins (Quinte): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

It's from 140 people from the Quinte area, and I affix my name to it.

BIBLIOTHÈQUES PUBLIQUES

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Prescott et Russell) : J'ai ici une pétition qui vient de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Rockland.

«Aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

«Étant donné que nous croyons fermement que la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en Ontario est un droit fondamental de tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes ;

«Nous, les soussignés, demandons aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario de sauvegarder la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en s'assurant de maintenir ce qui suit :

«(1) Les subventions provinciales qui permettent d'assurer à tous les Ontariens et à toutes les Ontariennes un accès équitable aux documents et aux services de bibliothèque publique ;

«(2) La coordination des programmes de partage des ressources tels que le système de prêt entre bibliothèques et l'accès au réseau Internet ;

«(3) Une politique permettant d'assurer l'existence du réseau des bibliothèques publiques de l'Ontario ;

«(4) L'aide directe de la part du gouvernement provincial au niveau du service, par exemple par l'entremise du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario-Sud et du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario du Nord ;

«(5) Une loi maintenant l'autonomie des conseils d'administration des bibliothèques publiques.»

J'y ajoute ma signature.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario signed by citizens from across the greater Toronto area, including

a number of residents of my constituency, Beaches-Woodbine.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Harris government has begun a process to open the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario; and

"Whereas this act is the single most important piece of legislation for working people since it is designed to protect our lives, safety and health while at work and allow us to return home to our families in the same condition in which we left; and

"Whereas the government has made it clear that they intend to water down the act and weaken the rights of workers under the law, including the right to know, the right to participate and especially the right to refuse; and

"Whereas this government has already watered down proper training of certified committee members;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario not to alter the Occupational Health and Safety Act or erode the rights of workers any further and ensure strict enforcement of the legislation."

I am proud to affix my signature, as I am in complete agreement.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): I appreciate the privilege to speak here in the House today.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Liberal member from Windsor-Sandwich, Ms Papatello, presented a resolution during private members' period on Thursday, February 27, 1997, in the morning;

"Whereas the resolution was poorly worded and indeed contradictory;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To either ignore resolution 67 or caution the Legislative Assembly's standing committee on social development of the contradictions inherent within the wording of the resolution.

"Furthermore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to return to the original Progressive Conservative mandate to ensure that every Ontarian has equal access to high-quality health care.

"Furthermore, that the government of Ontario is encouraged to have the federal Liberal government in Ottawa pay its fair share.

"Therefore, be it resolved that resolution 67 is considerably seriously flawed and unjust for many Ontarians."

I'm pleased to affix my name to this petition.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario is proposing to restructure completely the provincial-municipal relationship without having consulted the people of Ontario; and

"Whereas this restructuring proposes to download to municipalities the cost of transportation and such critical social services as welfare and long-term care for the elderly and the chronically ill; and

"Removes school boards' ability to tax, eliminating any effective local control over schools and school programs; and

"The government's actions fail to guarantee existing levels of funding and fail to recognize the unequal ability of local communities to bear the cost of these new burdens, thus producing inequitable access to essential services; and

"Whereas the government's lack of meaningful public consultation and disregard for public response pose a serious threat to democracy;

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, because we care about the quality of life in our province and the wellbeing of our children, neighbours and communities, register a vote of non-confidence in the government in the province of Ontario."

I have affixed my signature on this.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have a petition forwarded to me by Brad Grimwood, who's a Cambridge firefighter, and Mark McKinnon, who's a Toronto firefighter. Their petition reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

This is signed by many citizens from Oakville, and I add my name to theirs.

HOSPITAL FINANCING

Mrs Barbara Fisher (Bruce): I'd like to present a petition on behalf of some of the constituents in the riding of Bruce.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cut to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to call on the Conservative government to stop the cuts to base funding for hospitals across Ontario and to ensure that community services are in place before the removal of hospital services. The Conservative government must fund hospitals with a funding formula that reflects demographic and regional needs. The Conservative government must ensure that health services are available, including emergency and urgent care, to all Ontarians."

TVONTARIO

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): I have a petition sent to me by Ms Chris McLean of Thunder Bay, who's a strong supporter of TVOntario.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas TVOntario has served Ontarians of all ages for more than 25 years with quality non-commercial television that continues to focus 70% of its programming on education and children's programming; and

"Whereas TVO is available to 97.4% of Ontarians and for some uncabled communities is the only station available, making it a truly provincial asset; and

"Whereas TVO continues to work towards increasing self-generated revenues;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to ensure that TVOntario continue to be a publicly owned and funded educational broadcaster."

I'm proud to sign my name to this.

1520

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I have further petitions signed by citizens from Harrow and Windsor:

To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas it is vital that occupational health and safety services provided to workers be conducted by organizations in which workers have faith; and

"Whereas the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers have provided such services on behalf of workers for many years; and

"Whereas the centre and clinics have made a significant contribution to improvements in workplace health and safety and the reduction of injuries, illnesses and death caused by work;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to oppose any attempt to erode the structure, services or funding of the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers.

"Further we, the undersigned, demand that the education and training of Ontario workers continue in its present form through the Workers' Health and Safety Centre and that professional and technical expertise and advice continue to be provided through the occupational health clinics for Ontario workers."

I add my name to theirs.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): I have a petition of 150 good citizens of Cambridge. It's directed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that would undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to the professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

Pursuant to the standing orders, I affix my name to it.

NORTH YORK BRANSON HOSPITAL

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee

has recommended that North York Branson Hospital merge with York-Finch hospital; and

"Whereas this recommendation will remove emergency and inpatient services currently provided by North York Branson Hospital, which will seriously jeopardize medical care and the quality of health for the growing population which the hospital serves, many being elderly people who in numerous cases require treatment for life-threatening medical conditions;

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reject the recommendation contained within the final report of the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee as it pertains to North York Branson Hospital, so that it retains, at minimum, emergency and inpatient services."

I have affixed my signature.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I beg leave to present the 33rd report of the standing committee on government agencies.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Does the vice-chair wish to make a brief statement? No?

Pursuant to standing order 106(g)(11), the report is deemed to be adopted by the House.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on estimates.

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals (Mr Alex D. McFedries): The standing committee on estimates presents the committee's report as follows —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Dispense? Dispense.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I believe we have unanimous consent to call the 19th order and have a division on second reading of Bill 109 and that there would be a five-minute bell.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Unanimous consent? Agreed.

LOCAL CONTROL OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT, 1997

LOI DE 1997 SUR LE CONTRÔLE LOCAL DES BIBLIOTHÈQUES PUBLIQUES

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 109, An Act to amend the Public Libraries Act to put authority, responsibility and accountability for providing and effectively managing local

library services at the local level / *Projet de loi 109, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les bibliothèques publiques de façon à situer à l'échelon local les pouvoirs, la responsabilité et l'obligation de rendre compte concernant la fourniture et la gestion efficace des services locaux de bibliothèque.*

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): It will be a five-minute bell; call in the members.

The division bells rang from 1526 to 1531.

The Speaker: All those in favour of Bill 109, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bassett, Isabel	Hamick, Charles	Parker, John L.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hastings, John	Pettit, Trevor
Boushy, Dave	Hodgson, Chris	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Brown, Jim	Hudak, Tim	Ross, Lillian
Carr, Gary	Jackson, Cameron	Sampson, Rob
Carroll, Jack	Johns, Helen	Shea, Derwyn
Chudleigh, Ted	Johnson, David	Sheehan, Frank
Cunningham, Dianne	Jordan, W. Leo	Smith, Bruce
DeFaria, Carl	Kells, Morley	Snobelen, John
Doyle, Ed	Klees, Frank	Spina, Joseph
Ecker, Janet	Leadston, Gary L.	Stewart, R. Gary
Elliott, Brenda	Marland, Margaret	Turnbull, David
Fisher, Barbara	Martiniuk, Gerry	Vankoughnet, Bill
Flaherty, Jim	McLean, Allan K.	Villeneuve, Noble
Ford, Douglas B.	Munro, Julia	Wilson, Jim
Fox, Gary	Murdoch, Bill	Witmer, Elizabeth
Froese, Tom	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Newman, Dan	Young, Terence H.
Gilchrist, Steve	O'Toole, John	

The Speaker: All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	Phillips, Gerry
Boyd, Marion	Kormos, Peter	Pouliot, Gilles
Bradley, James J.	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Caplan, Elinor	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ruprecht, Tony
Castrilli, Annamarie	Lankin, Frances	Sergio, Mario
Cleary, John C.	Marchese, Rosario	Silipo, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Martel, Shelley	Wildman, Bud
Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony	Wood, Len
Gerretsen, John	Miclash, Frank	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Patten, Richard	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 59; the nays are 28.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, it goes to the general government committee for public input and debate.

The Speaker: So ordered.

FAIR MUNICIPAL FINANCE ACT, 1997 LOI DE 1997 SUR LE FINANCEMENT ÉQUITABLE DES MUNICIPALITÉS

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 106, An Act respecting the

financing of local government / *Projet de loi 106, Loi concernant le financement des administrations locales.*

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The member for St Catharines.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I'm glad that so many members are interested in my remarks right now —

The Speaker: You seem to have an interesting habit of clearing a room, member for St Catharines. I'll just give them a moment to find their way out. Don't worry if you hear an echo as you speak. Member for St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to address this particular piece of legislation. I know that those members who have to leave at this time will be watching it on the television sets in their offices. The member for Beaches-Woodbine has already said that she's even going to rush there so she can catch the remainder of my speech on this bill.

This is an important bill, there's no question about that, but we have to look at the reason that this bill is being introduced. I know it's against the wishes of some members of the Conservative caucus. I know the government whip, for instance, the minister for Don Mills-York Mills in his case, must be very concerned about the implications for the people in his riding. Ms Bassett, who was in the House today, will be very concerned about the implications for her riding.

What's happening is that the government is doing this while it is doing everything else. They don't want people to know what they are doing in this particular case so they are putting this in the context of the downloading that is taking place, the hospital closings that are taking place and many other initiatives that are taking place. We know it will affect many people adversely and that those people will certainly be speaking to the members of the government.

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke-Rexdale): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I'd like to point out to the member for St Catharines that I believe it's the tradition and the rules of the standing orders that we refer to members by their ridings, not by their names. The member for St Catharines is a veteran here. I thought he would know that. I'm totally surprised and shocked.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Gilles Pouliot): Your point is well taken. The member for St Catharines will indeed acquiesce.

Mr Bradley: I'll absolutely acquiesce, but the problem is that many people who watch this on television, and there's an audience of millions, I should say to my friend the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, don't know the members by their ridings. I should perhaps correct it to say Isabel Bassett, the member for St Andrew-St Patrick, which I think is a reasonable way of putting it. People don't know necessarily who the people are for each riding and I want them to be able to know that out there.

Mr Hastings: On a point of privilege.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Etobicoke wishes to be repetitious.

Mr Hastings: My point is that the member ought to be following the names of each of the ridings from which the members come. This weak excuse that the viewers

don't know just doesn't cut it. Let's get back to tradition. The member is always talking about tradition and integrity in the House. Then let him carry through on his words for a change and address the members by the actual names of their ridings, not their surnames.

The Acting Speaker: The point has been made. Thank you.

Mr Bradley: Thank you for taking up so much of my time on trivialities this afternoon. I will remember that when you are up. This debate may not end today.

The Acting Speaker: Now what?

Mr Hastings: Now what, since you think it's so much of a "now what," I didn't think that any of the members in here could be referred to as trivialities or irrelevancies. I think the point of privilege is that the member ought to be addressing members by their ridings, not by their names. How many times do you have to make the point, Speaker?

The Acting Speaker: Obviously not as often as you are attempting to do. Thank you. The member for St Catharines, please.

Mr Bradley: Again I hope we are able to complete the debate because I want to tell you something. When we get interrupted this way, sometimes we are unable to complete the debate because we don't get all of our words on the record, and when we have to do that, sometimes the debate goes into the next day. I wouldn't want to see that happen because I know that the government House leader is very concerned that this bill get through today. That's all I worry about, because I know the government is eager to rush its agenda through.

1540

You would know, for instance, that today is a very difficult day. This is a difficult week for the government. They just lost the referendum in Toronto. They lost a major referendum where the people said to the Conservative government of Mike Harris, the Premier of Ontario, the member for Nipissing, that they did not agree with his government trying to ram the megacity bill past the people of Metropolitan Toronto and in overwhelming numbers, some 76%, they said to the government, "We reject what you're trying to do."

You noticed, Mr Speaker, as I did today, the news that the Minister of Environment, the member for Carleton, I believe, is his riding — Norm Sterling as he's known to the members in this House, but the member for Carleton as he would be known in his own caucus — was removed from the position of overseer of the Niagara Escarpment Commission. It looks as though the good old boys have won that particular battle, because the parliamentary assistant, my good friend the member for Grey-Owen Sound, who was noted in his past incarnation for being in favour of a number of severances — he gladly calls himself "the severance king." I know he has said that in years gone by. He smiles as I say that. He doesn't object to that. He has now been placed in the position, as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources, of having some say over who's going to get appointed to the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Can you imagine the Niagara Escarpment Commission with the appointees that are recommended by my good friend the member for Grey-Owen Sound, who has been

one of the strongest opponents of the work of the Niagara Escarpment Commission over the years? I know he's happy I said this because in his riding this will be perhaps an asset, but I think that in the rest of the province there may be a disagreement with that. But I don't want to get into that subject at great length.

Mr Bill Murdoch (Grey-Owen Sound): Point of order.

The Acting Speaker: Member for Grey-Owen Sound, which standing order?

Mr Murdoch: I'd like to point out that I'm parliamentary assistant, Northern Development and Mines, not Natural Resources.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you kindly.

Mr Bradley: I'm glad you made that clarification. What I wanted to point out — but the member for Rexdale was annoyed that I was using names. In this case, I'll have to say it. He's the parliamentary assistant to Chris Hodgson, who is the Minister of Natural Resources, as well as the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. So he's the parliamentary assistant to the minister who will have jurisdiction over the Niagara Escarpment Commission and that is, I can tell you, a great worry to the many environmentalists, including Conservatives, in this province who now see that the one individual who was committed to Niagara Escarpment preservation — I'll give him his credit, as I have on many occasions. If I didn't agree with anything else, I would say that Norm Sterling was very committed as the Minister of Environment to preserving the Niagara Escarpment. He was the person in the Davis administration, when he had the position of Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, responsible for establishing the commission and I know we all had his assurance that he would be there to protect the Niagara Escarpment.

Premier Harris has now removed him from that responsibility and turned it over to the Ministry of Natural Resources. The Ministry of Natural Resources could never be accused of being pro-environment. You could never accuse them of being raving environmentalists. My friend the member for Grey-Owen Sound would know that, which is why he smiles now that the Niagara Escarpment is in someone else's jurisdiction. It is a sad day for the environment. I think everyone agrees with that.

Interjections.

Mr Bradley: Some members don't. Some members obviously resent the fact that the Honourable Norm Sterling was getting credit for being a person who cared about the preserving of the Niagara Escarpment. They resent that.

I can understand why the minister today, when asked a question, flipped the question over to the Minister of Natural Resources, because he has had the knees kicked out from underneath him. He's had his legs severed by the Premier by taking away this responsibility. The one person in the cabinet who I knew — maybe there are others — cared about the Niagara Escarpment and its lands has been removed from that.

The member for Bruce is happy. The good old boys are in charge of it now. Bill and the boys are now in charge of it, and the good old girls I guess, if you're

allowed to say that — whatever. The good old women, the good old men are in charge of it now and Norm Sterling is taken out of that responsibility.

Every person with an environmental concern in this province — I'm talking Conservatives too — is going to be shocked and saddened by this development by the Premier. I don't know whether it's a sop to some of the rural members because he's closing their hospitals; I don't know whether that's the reason and so this is a way to try to make up for it. But whatever has happened, it is a bad day for the environment, and I think the government should be ashamed of itself.

I know those who genuinely care about the environment will be raising this with the Premier in the caucus of the Conservative Party next time it meets, because there have to be some people — I look across at my friend the Minister of Labour. I'm sure she must be shocked and saddened and surprised by this particular development, because she's a moderate on this issue; she's a person I consider to be a moderate in the cabinet. Although I may not agree with the policies she brings forward in labour, I happen to think she is a moderate and an open-minded person on a number of issues. She must lament the loss of Norm Sterling as the protector of the Niagara Escarpment.

I know this is a matter of great concern to the government members now. They're hearing me talk about this. They're saying, "How on earth does this relate to this bill?" How is it related to the bill? It's related to Bill Murdoch, that's how it's related.

There are many people in the environmental movement who are surprised today, particularly that this was done so sneakily, so quietly. Behind closed doors in a very secretive fashion the torch is passed from the man who cares about the Niagara Escarpment and its protection to the unknown, to the Minister of Natural Resources and his parliamentary assistant, the member for Grey-Owen Sound, who, along with my friend the member for Lincoln, have been campaigning for this to happen for some period of time.

It may get you some marks with certain people. We may be seeing severances. We'll probably see the Escarpment Hilton, the Escarpment Holiday Inn, the Escarpment Howard Johnsons. We'll see pits and quarries all over, we'll see garbage dumps, we'll see all kinds of development, and the severances will be aflowin'. It'll be like the good old days when my friend the member for Grey-Owen Sound was in municipal government, granting severances willy-nilly at that time. I think it's unfortunate.

The Speaker: The member for St Catharines, I just got back in the chair, and I was certain when I left we were debating the financing of local government. I'm lost.

Mr Bradley: I thank the Speaker for pointing that out. I was saying that this is because we must look at these bills in the context of the entire government program and all the initiatives.

I have here a very important report that would relate to this. It's called The Mike Harris Plan... "Fundamentally Flawed," and it is authored by Dalton McGuinty, MPP, and Gerry Phillips, MPP. It's a report of the community impact review committee of the Ontario Liberal caucus,

which actually went out and spoke to municipal politicians about the problems that exist. It's an important report.

Everybody in the province, including you, Mr Speaker, will want a copy of this report, because it is one which really exposes what this government is up to. Who exposes it? The municipal politicians. You remember; you were a municipal politician. You would have been shocked, I'm sure, Mr Speaker, because you were that kind of person, a dedicated municipal representative. He would have been, I assure you. This Speaker would have been very concerned if he heard the Premier calling him a whiner.

I wouldn't have called this Speaker a whiner. I was the Minister of the Environment when this gentleman, the Speaker in the chair, Chris Stockwell, the member for Etobicoke West, was a municipal councillor. When he had something to say, he said it. He wasn't always complimentary of what the Ministry of the Environment of the day was doing, but I didn't call him a whiner. I didn't say he was a whiner; I said: "He is entitled to that point of view. I'm glad to see this vigorous debate." He may have been wrong, but he was not a whiner, of that I can assure you.

I know that all members of the public and all members of the news media will be interested in this document, which has many quotes from municipal politicians, the people the Premier calls "winners," about what is happening as a result of the downloading. I suspect they're even talking about this bill. I would say they're talking about this bill.

1550

I look at the names quoted here, and I can tell you there are a lot of Tories on here or people who might have supported the Conservatives in the last election who are absolutely astounded that they are going to be forced either to raise taxes very significantly — property taxes, that do not take into account a person's ability to pay — or they're going to be forced to impose user fees, which are hardest on the lowest-income people in our society.

In other words, the kids who have to play hockey — the rich kids will continue to play hockey because their parents will have enough money to pay a registration fee which must take into account the cost of ice and other services provided by the municipality. Municipalities are going to be forced to do that or severely cut services. As we all know, rich people, the privileged people in our society, can afford those services, can buy them privately, can go elsewhere to get those services, but the average person in our society can't do that.

That's why this report produced by Dalton McGuinty and Gerry Phillips, a report that took the input that came from various municipalities, is such an important report. No doubt some of the people commented on the provisions of this bill we have before us today as well as all the downloading, because municipalities are having huge new costs and huge new responsibilities thrust upon them, responsibilities and costs which are best borne at the provincial level as opposed to the local level.

I was pleased that the St Catharines city council passed a resolution — I think it was 11 to 2 — calling upon this government to stop its downloading, to reconsider its

position so that municipalities would not feel this adverse impact, so we wouldn't see gigantic increases in municipal taxes and of course the blame that goes with either the raising of those taxes or the cutting of important services while this government gives an income tax cut to the richest people in our society.

The Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I'm glad to rise and congratulate the member for St Catharines for his, as usual, broad view of this bill and most of the bills he speaks to, certainly for his ability to connect the various pieces this government has, really of its own doing, put in front of us: Bill 106 that we're dealing with today, which will increase property taxes on many residences, people who live in their homes or people who rent, as well as on small businesses. I'll have a chance to talk a little more about that when I get up in a little while.

The member for St Catharines clearly linked what happens in this bill to the whole downloading of costs that this government is putting through in all the various measures. We certainly have seen that in spades in terms of their announcements to take education from the property tax but to replace it with something that will make the situation far worse by having costs like social services and a number of health care service costs put on to the property tax base, clearly things that don't belong on the property tax base and things that now even this government, because many people across this province are realizing that is wrong and saying it is wrong, is beginning to at least understand they've made a big mistake about.

It will be interesting to see how they deal with that. If you judge from some of the statements we've heard today and statements in the media that ministers are looking at making some changes, particularly on the social assistance side, it will be interesting to see what they come up with. But clearly the message is there, they've received the message, and I think the member for St Catharines has tied that message very well to the specific provisions under Bill 106 that will help that download which the government seems to be so intent on doing.

Mr Murdoch: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for this short time to speak on this bill and to speak on some of the comments from my good friend from St Catharines. He talks about the Niagara Escarpment. You know, there's something we must get quite clear here. I don't believe there's a Conservative over on this side who doesn't want to protect the escarpment. He gets a little mixed up in some of his comments. There's a Niagara Escarpment Commission, but there's also the Niagara Escarpment. I want it to be quite clear that, myself included, there isn't a member over here who doesn't want to protect the escarpment. We've known that forever.

He sometimes gets confused, and he's one who should know. He's the one who probably caused us more trouble than anybody on this whole escarpment deal when he was the Minister of the Environment and took it out of municipal affairs, where it should have been left. But I can live with it going to natural resources. I know the Minister of Natural Resources has concerns about the escarpment and he certainly will protect it.

Also, he mentioned that our Minister of Environment has done a good job of doing that and now it's in a spot where we can look at the parks system, which the escarpment was set up for. The Niagara Escarpment was there and the commission was to set up a parks system from Niagara Falls right up to Tobermory, and now it's in a ministry that can do that; a minister who will know about the parks system because he has that in his system.

It's unfortunate that the opposition on the other side, and especially my friend from St Catharines, gets a little mixed up in his age. This happens, I guess, when maybe sometimes you've been here too long. You sort of get names mixed up.

We're all concerned about the Niagara Escarpment, and in Grey county we've protected it more than anybody. I can tell you right now we have more land in the escarpment area than anybody and we have protected it quite well, and we haven't created a lot of severances on the escarpment. Off the escarpment, yes, maybe, but that's development and we like development in our area. But as far as the escarpment goes —

The Speaker: Thank you. The member for Kenora.

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): I would like as well to congratulate the member for St Catharines on his comments. He has touched on many issues that not only affect the southern portion of the province but affect small-town northwestern Ontario as well: the choice that the municipal leaders of all the communities within Ontario are going to have to face in the upcoming years, whether it be the cutting of services or the increase in user fees, the placing of user fees on various activities which have never seen them before. These are things that municipal councillors from across the province are going to have to contend with and things that they're going to have to take a very close look at.

As well, he has indicated that there is a true concern out there that what this government has done is certainly not, and nowhere close to being, revenue-neutral when it comes to small-town Ontario or any of the municipalities within the province. They're finding that they're going to run large deficits. Michael Power, the future president of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, has indicated very clearly that what is being passed on to the municipalities in Ontario is certainly going to add to their costs.

The member also refers to a document called The Mike Harris Plan... "Fundamentally Flawed." This is a document of course developed by co-chairs Dalton McGuinty, my leader, and Gerry Phillips, who have gone out to municipalities throughout the province and have listened to presentations from municipal councillors, from citizens, and they have all indicated that this plan is fundamentally flawed and it has to be changed. This document I'm sure will be of great interest to the citizens of Ontario.

In wrapping up, I'd just like to again congratulate the member for St Catharines on his comments. They truly fit a pattern which we see throughout this entire province.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): Mr Speaker, I have a new-found respect both for you and for your tenure. Your courage is great.

The Premier has chosen to deal the long-standing member for Carleton a very bad hand. He's the one who

established the dossier of the Niagara Escarpment, and that man there, Harris, took it away and gave it to the minister who handles a chainsaw and an axe and guts the ministry and services to people, that of Natural Resources — really unfair. When you look at Bill 106 and when you know the creator of this ongoing atrocity, you have to be against, like the member for St Catharines has mentioned so well, all aspects of the bill.

What do we have here? We have a scheme. We have a mechanism in place that allows for downloading. There is nothing which is revenue-neutral. The losers are the taxpayers of Ontario. There's no question about it. The government gives you a break, so they say, on education, but education is the most predictable of costs. The same government leaves you hanging with the unpredictable, with the demographics: More people, an aging population as a whole, and the taxpayers will pay the payola like they've always done.

1600

At the same time as they're closing hospitals, the people who can run the fastest will line their pockets one more time. Does it make a lot of sense? Is this commonsensical? Only for them.

The Speaker: Thank you. The member for St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: Thank you to the members for Dovercourt, Grey-Owen Sound, Kenora and Lake Nipigon for their contributions to this debate. It's symbolic that the member for Grey-Owen Sound, whom we affectionately know as Bill Murdoch, is now sitting in the Minister of Environment's chair, the Minister of Environment having been deposed as the person in charge of the Niagara Escarpment Commission. I wish there were photographers around or that the cameras were allowed to pan the House at this time and we could see this, because it is not only symbolic, it is realistic. The Minister of Environment has been turfed from that particular position.

I know he must be livid with the Premier. I don't blame him for being livid with the Premier. I must say that being criticized as Minister of the Environment for my actions with the Niagara Escarpment Commission by the member for Grey-Owen Sound, of course, is a real plus, because he was the person who was in charge of all the severances. He's always pro-severance. I listened to this talk about protection. Listen, there wouldn't have been applause over there if they had known that the Honourable Norm Sterling was going to be taken out of that responsibility.

Members mentioned other things. I was surprised that one of the government members didn't get up and talk about the hospital closings in the Niagara region. The hospital in Port Colborne, the hospital in Fort Erie, the Hotel Dieu in St Catharines, the Niagara-on-the-Lake hospital, the West Lincoln Memorial in Grimsby — all of those hospitals are destined to be closed by the local hospital closing commission because the Harris government is going to provide a \$44-million cut in hospital funding.

I know that those who adhere to and support the Common Sense Revolution must then adhere to and support the closing of hospitals, because that's what

results from the Common Sense Revolution that gives a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our society.

The Speaker: Further debate? The member for Dovercourt.

Mr Silipo: I rise to join in this debate on Bill 106 with some interest because I've been following, of course, more closely some of the other bills. We just voted earlier today on Bill 109, the libraries bill that will reduce the support that exists now for libraries by, among other things, moving the protection for fees — no fees for the use of libraries that exists now in legislation — into regulation.

I've been following more closely the debate on Bill 103 as the GTA critic for our caucus, the megacity bill, but I've also been paying attention, albeit a little bit from the sidelines, to Bill 106 because there are a couple of important provisions in terms of what this bill does that I think it's important that people out there understand.

I fear that at least one aspect of this hasn't been discussed anywhere near the level that it needs to be and I want to talk a little bit about that. That is, what does this bill do for businesses, particularly small businesses? I want to come back to that.

But let's just take a look at what this bill is supposed to do. The bill is called the Fair Municipal Finance Act. If you believe the government line, you would believe that what this government is doing through this bill is putting together a system of financing, or how we raise taxes at the local level, in a way that would be fair. Again, at a superficial level you actually could buy that argument because if you look at the notions that are here, it says one of the things that's going to happen is we're going to have a new assessment system in a way that will ensure that properties of the same value pay the same level of property taxes. That's generally the notion.

The reality is not quite that. The reality is that's not quite what's going to be happening. Of course, we have the nuance between market value assessment and actual value assessment. I know the government makes a lot out of saying this isn't market value assessment; this is in fact actual value assessment. I think at the end of the day, if you ask the typical homeowner or tenant who is going to be paying this, or if you ask the typical small businessperson who is going to be paying the tax that will be levied through this, they won't see a particular difference between AVA or MVA.

What they will see in many cases is just more taxes, and that's the sad thing about this, because I think we can agree that there needs to be some fixing of how the assessment system works, but this doesn't do it. This doesn't do it, because what we are doing is going right across the province now to clearly a more market value assessment system, a system that's going to tie more closely the taxes that people pay on their properties or businesses to the value of that property.

Interjection.

Mr Silipo: One of the members opposite is saying we backed away from that. Well, he's absolutely right. We looked at putting in place a system similar to this and we realized that it wasn't going to work. We realized it wasn't going to work for the home owners. We realized it wasn't going to work for the renters. We also realized

it wasn't going to work for some of the business sectors. In fact, some of the stronger voices that came out at the time we were dealing with this were from the various business sectors. They pointed out to us the problems with moving to this kind of a system, and now, lo and behold, we have the government that purports to be supportive of business going ahead with exactly a scheme that will have nothing but increases generally for people across the province in terms of their property taxes.

But that should not come as any great surprise, because that really is what this government has been doing. That really is very much the attitude and the approach that this government has been taking, despite the fact that Mike Harris so proudly, prior to and during the last election, went around the province saying, "There's only one taxpayer, and no government should try to resolve its fiscal problems by downloading them on to another level of government."

We hear the Minister of Health continue to remind this House, as he should, about the over \$2 billion in cuts of the federal Liberal government. The cutting of transfers to the province and the difficulties that poses for our health care system doesn't justify the additional cuts that the Minister of Health is imposing on our hospitals, but at least in reminding Ontarians and reminding members of this Legislature, as he does, that the problem really started with the Liberal government in Ottawa and with their cuts of \$2 billion to the health care system, not to mention the cuts to the social assistance system and the rest of the social structure, he's correct in doing that. He's correct in reminding people.

You would think that a government that understood and understands how bad a policy that is when the federal government solves its fiscal problems, reduces its deficit, by simply reducing the funds that it transfers to provinces, particularly to Ontario, wouldn't then turn around and do exactly the same thing to municipalities and school boards.

Yet we know that what we have here in Bill 106 is merely one piece out of five or six key pieces that all have as their collective objective cutting \$3 billion out of the provincial expenditures, or finding \$3 billion. Why? Because of all the promises that Mike Harris made, the only one he seems to be really intent on keeping is the one about the 30% provincial income tax cut. That's the one that's going to mean that people who are already well off are going to be better off, and that's the one that's going to mean that the average family is going to be worse off.

When they look at the little advantage they will get, the little benefit they will get from that 30% tax cut against the increases in a variety of ways in which they're going to be paying more, including higher property taxes, then the average family of middle income and low income will end up paying more. That's what his is all about. That's what this whole special session of the Legislature is all about.

It's not about streamlining the responsibilities of government between the provincial government and the local government, although, yes, there's a little tinkering going on with that. It's not about giving municipalities

greater power because the greater power that you're giving them is either to cut services or increase taxes or a combination of those two. Now we hear that there is even talk that maybe one of the things that the government will do in Bill 103, or maybe they'll apply it across the province, is to bring in a provision that will say local property taxes can't be increased.

1610

Then what we'll do is we'll just leave municipalities with the only choice being that they can just cut services and they can do the hatchet work for the Mike Harris government. This from the Premier, this from the politician who said that he was going to keep his promises and this from the politician who said, "You don't resolve your problems by downloading." "There's only one taxpayer," he used to say. I haven't heard him say that very much these days.

When we look at Bill 106, we have to first of all look at it in that context of how it ties to the rest of the downloading. When we look more specifically at what we see inside Bill 106, we see that within it there are clearly provisions that will result in increases. I mentioned earlier the impact this will have on small business. If you look at the bill, there's just a very short section; even the explanatory note at the front of the bill talks about business assessment. It's the second issue addressed under the explanatory note. It simply says:

"Currently, in addition to the assessment of land, persons carrying on a business are assessed for business assessment. The bill eliminates business assessment by repealing the current section 7 of the Assessment Act and making a number of other consequential amendments removing references to business assessment."

You would think by reading that and you would think by looking at the section in the bill, which is section 5, which repeals sections 7 and 8 of the Assessment Act and substitutes a new prescribed set of classes in a very short section, that what we're talking about here are relatively minor changes. Not if you happen to be a small business person. If you happen to be a small business person you'd better take a good, hard look at that particular provision in the bill. Why? Because what that does is eliminate the business occupancy tax.

That's a tax that's levied now on businesses on top of the property tax that businesses pay and it's levied against the operator of the business rather than the owner of the property. It's a tax paid by people running businesses in addition to the property tax. It's a tax that goes back to 1904, and Minister Eves when he introduced this bill referred to this and said: "The new legislation will scrap the outdated business occupancy tax. This tax has been on the books...since 1904." Here's the part that I found interesting going back and reading this statement, "It is based on very arbitrary tax rates that have absolutely no relation to the modern-day Ontario economy."

I find that really interesting because the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale earlier on was asking, "When are we going to go back to tradition?" Here's one tradition that we should be upholding, and I want to tell you why. The business occupancy tax, I would argue, of everything that exists under the property tax scheme in Ontario is

actually the most progressive part of the property tax system. Why is that? It's because the way in which that tax is levied is done in relation to some notion of how much people, or in this case businesses, can actually pay.

The rates vary by the type of business that's being taxed. The reason those rates vary is because at the time that the tax was brought in, again back in 1904, the variable rates were based on the perceived ability to pay. Some types of businesses were viewed generally as more profitable than others. In other words, that portion of the property tax is actually based on the notion that if you can afford to pay more, you should pay more and if you can't afford to pay more, you shouldn't.

Isn't it interesting that that's exactly what the income tax system has as a basic tenet; in other words, that people should pay progressively based on their ability to pay? It's the only section and the only portion of the property tax system that's based on that basic principle. Isn't it interesting that that's the piece being done away with?

People may say: "What's the big deal? What does that do?" Let's understand, first of all, that the business occupancy tax raises across the province \$1.6 billion. Within Metropolitan Toronto, to put it another way, there is \$600 million raised. That's a lot of money. What happens when the business occupancy tax is scrapped? At first blush, people who have businesses might think that's a good idea. They will say: "Well, there's a tax that now exists. That is being removed." But usually, when it comes to taxes being removed, people have gotten smart enough to ask the next question, which is, "What's going to replace it?" This is where the problem begins.

Municipalities are going to have some choices, but the choices they have are between a rock and a hard place. The question for the municipality is going to be, first of all, "Can you afford not to raise that money?" What municipality is going to be able not to raise that kind of money? I said it's \$600 million in Metropolitan Toronto alone; it's \$1.6 billion across the province if you add it all up.

It means the option that theoretically is being given to municipalities to say, "You don't have to raise this money," is not really an option. It's not an option, particularly because of the additional costs this government is putting on the municipal level. We know there's a gap of some \$1.5 billion already between the amount the province is pushing up to the income tax, primarily the education portion of the property tax, versus the amount they're pushing down on to the property tax, particularly like increasing from 20% to 50% the share municipalities will have to pay for social assistance, increasing long-term care costs to 50% from zero that the municipalities will have to pay, increasing the costs they will have to pay for public housing and child care, and the list goes on.

We know that in that tradeoff there's already a shortfall, meaning that just in and of itself, as a result of that, property taxes will inevitably increase or municipalities will have to make major cuts in the services they now provide. They're not going to have the room to be able to say, "We'll just find ways to absorb this." Then they

have to ask themselves the question, "If we're going to put this back on the tax system, how are we going to do it?"

They could decide to put it on to the residential property tax; they could do that. You find me a council that's going to be able to agree to shift what is now being taxed on businesses and put it on the residential property tax. I don't think there'll be too many councils doing that, and they shouldn't do that, in my view.

Their next choice will be, "If we keep it on the commercial, if we keep it on the business part of the property tax, what happens then?" This is the kicker, because what it means is that small businesses will get an increase and large businesses will get a decrease. If you're a bank or a large business institution, because of the new scheme you're likely to see a substantial enough decrease in that part of your property tax, but if you're a small business you're going to see a hefty increase in your taxes.

I'm not going to throw out numbers because, depending on the calculations, there are various numbers one can use. But any of the numbers I have seen clearly show that we could be seeing increases likely in the 50% range for small businesses in terms of this portion of their taxes, whereas banks and other large business institutions like that will likely see a decrease on average of about 40%.

That's very consistent with the philosophy of this government, which is, "If you're already well off, we're going to make you even richer, and the rest of you, we're going to make you pay for that."

1620

What troubles me is that I'm not sure that, so far, many small business people have actually latched on to this particular piece of the whole package of changes going on under this Who Does What process. But as they begin to realize this, their eyes will be opened and they will see that this government, rather than supporting small business, is in its tax changes going to be making life not only harder for small business but in some cases it will be the last straw, the last piece that will result in more small businesses simply closing up. I think I'm generally a reasonable person. I don't try to get people into a state of turmoil unless it's something that I strongly believe is the case. I strongly believe, as I read this and as I've had this interpreted for me, that this is what's going to happen.

I would say to small businesses right across the province to take a good hard look at what this government is doing. Rather than a supportive attitude, rather than the rhetoric — "We're streamlining things, we're cutting taxes, we're making things simpler, we're re-opening Ontario for business" — what we're going to see here is the closing of many small businesses. What will happen as a result of these business occupancy tax changes, especially and particularly for small business, is that we're going to see increases in the taxes that small businesses now are paying.

It's true, and I want to be fair to the government, that they have put in some provisions which at first blush would seem to temper that. But the reality, as I see it and

as I read it, is that the tempering won't be anywhere near the kind of protection that exists now under the business occupancy tax for small businesses in relation and in comparison to big business. That's something that should give small business operators right across the province some pause for thought.

Yes, it's good that we are cutting red tape, where we in fact are cutting red tape as opposed to simply getting rid of a whole bunch of regulations, which this government is doing. I remind members that in terms of beginning the process to remove red tape and facilitating registration for small businesses in one location or in one process as opposed to five or six different processes, as used to be the case, we were the government that actually put that in place. We certainly are glad and supportive when the government of the day continues along those lines and looks at making changes that go beyond that, where life, in terms of the reporting process, is made easier for small businesses. We believe that is where the majority of jobs are created and will continue to be created into the foreseeable future, through small businesses.

But I abhor completely a government and its actions, particularly compared to the rhetoric, which then in the most basic place important for small business — that is, the taxes they pay — in a sleight of hand results in higher taxes having to be paid by small businesses while large business is going to get a break. They're going to get a break not just through the 30% tax cut, but they're going to get a break if they're large businesses through the business occupancy tax changes. Small businesses, on the other hand, are going to get hit both ways: They're going to get hit first of all because they won't see much in the way of a benefit from that 30% tax cut, for which all this is being done, and second, they're going to be asked to pay for that portion on the business occupancy tax, because the only progressive part of the property tax system that exists now, that has been a tradition since 1904, to go back and paraphrase the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, is being removed by this government. That's what's happening.

When you add that to the other changes through the assessment, that will mean that for seniors, for people on fixed incomes, whether they're injured workers, whether they're people of low or middle income, they will see their property taxes go up as a result of the imposition of market value assessment. Many certainly in my constituency will see that happen to them. I think in the name of fairness what you're going to see are people who have not a lot in the way of income but who have put their energies and their resources into building their home, into keeping their home, into paying for their home, and now they're going to get whacked and they're going to get whacked really hard.

I don't want to stand here and say that I'm opposed to finding a system to ensure that each pay their own fair share of taxes, but that's not what this is doing. What this is doing is ensuring that the average family of modest means is going to pay even more.

The new assessment system that will kick in place, while people will argue, because of the way it's been assessed, it's not going to have quite the same severe impact

perhaps initially as would have happened under the 1988 assessment rolls, because properties, at least here in Metropolitan Toronto, have generally gone down in price, that gives you an indication of the volatility that's involved here. Even the three-year averaging of those costs that is envisioned in this bill will result at the end of the day in people's property taxes going up and going up in a continuously uncertain way.

That's not what property taxes should be about. Property taxes should be about paying for the so-called hard services — that's a phrase we continue to use — about paying for things that have to do with servicing that property, by and large.

I happen to agree with one particular piece that the government is doing in terms of moving services like the cost of education off the property tax, but I have to say unequivocally that I'm opposed to why they're doing it. I'm opposed to them doing it in the context that they're doing it now because they're not doing it to make the tax system fairer; they are doing it in effect to facilitate taking \$1 billion out of the education system.

Once the Minister of Education will have full control of all the moneys spent on education, he will be able to implement his ridiculous notion about 45% of those funds being spent outside of the classroom, notwithstanding the fact that in that calculation he includes principals, vice-principals, support staff and many other services that directly support what goes on in the classroom, not to mention the fact that I thought we had moved away from the notion of the one-room school house to a notion that says that the way in which you best educate young people is, first of all, within the four walls not of the classroom but the four walls of the school, and second, and just as important, how you best educate our young people is in the broader community, that not all learning goes on inside the classroom alone.

Even for those reasons, what the Minister of Education is doing is wrong.

1630

But the removal of education from the property tax as a notion and as a principle is a good one, because like other soft services that really are province-wide, education doesn't belong on the property tax. But when it's done as it is being done by this government, not in order to make the tax system fairer but in order to simply facilitate them taking \$1 billion out and adding that to the billion and a half they're taking out through the downloading and adding that to the \$500 million or so they have put as part of their transition funding, which we don't expect to ever see them spending, there, lo and behold, you have the \$3 billion that Mike Harris and Ernie Eves need to be able to fund the remaining 50% of the 30% tax cut. As I began, so I wish to end: That's what this is all about.

Through Bill 106 there is an increase, particularly to small businesses. There is an increase to many homeowners and renters who live on properties that have been, under the traditional system, "underassessed." They will end up paying much more than they're paying now. It will mean — notwithstanding the transition provisions that are here, which I don't know if municipalities will even be able to take advantage of, because again they're

dealing with having to find room for a whole bunch more cuts, and so I'm not sure how much the provisions that temper the transition of those increases will mean at the end of the day. But even if they were to be implemented, the volatility that's going to be there in terms of those increases will make it harder, particularly for people on fixed incomes.

We're going to see higher property taxes, particularly through the provisions of Bill 106. We're definitely going to see higher property taxes as a result of the broader policies of this government, through the downloading. We're going to see, in effect, less money spent at the end of the day on our school system, because as the ministry and the government grab the \$5.4 billion currently being raised through property taxes off the property tax system, what they will do with that is to simply take \$1 billion out of it.

We're going to get less in the way of services, we're going to get more in the way of taxes, if you're the average family across the province. If you're well off, if you're rich, you're going to get a 30% tax break; if you're the rest of us, you're going to pay through the nose. That's the reality, that's the Mike Harris world, that's the Mike Harris revolution. People are realizing that more and more, and that's why this last Monday you saw the result that you did here in Toronto, and that's why people are going to continue to be upset.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Questions or comments?

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): It's a pleasure to rise and participate briefly on Bill 106, An Act respecting the financing of local government, and to respond to the member for Dovercourt, who made some comments. I was pleased that he has suggested he's supportive of removing education funding off the municipal tax base, because in that he's certainly in harmony with most of the residents of Ontario and most of the organizations representing AMO and ROMA and other elected officials in our municipalities.

The member knows full well that the assessment system has been broken for many years. In fact, their government was conducting research, whether it was the Fair Tax Commission or a series of investigations. They backed away from it. That's the truth of it all. We all recall the newspaper stories of how there was a great outrage.

But let's face it, if a tax in a community is not fairly distributed, then there's an unfairness inherent in it. Is he suggesting, for example, that we agree with something that's inherently unfair? The most envisioned function of the property tax system is to distribute the cost of services fairly over the whole tax base. It should be revenue-neutral. In other words, if a property tax goes up, one will go down.

He has to get with the trend, that there are no more tax increases. You're just missing it. There are no more tax increases. We've hit the wall; we've hit the ceiling. But it has to be distributed fairly, and that does include the business sector. The issue of fairness is not one of user pays; everyone should pay their fair share. I hope the member isn't suggesting for a moment that the assessment system is somehow a progressive tax system at the

same time. I'd like to hear his response on the progressive nature of the assessment system, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr John C. Cleary (Cornwall): I share some of the concerns the member for Dovercourt had about some of the changes in the legislation. I know property taxpayers can only pay so much. There were a number of other issues that weren't touched on.

The ministry is forcing some of the municipalities to upgrade their sewer and water projects, and some of these studies are complete and some aren't. Many in our part of Ontario, about 20 municipalities, are very concerned about the percentage they used to get from the provincial government; they're worried now that the money will not be there and the projects will not proceed. Some of these are older plants that have been in the municipality for a number of years.

The other thing they're very worried about are the worn-out provincial highways that have been dumped on them, on top of everything else, with no funds to upgrade them, in some cases 30% and in many cases less. These highways are worn out and they're going to be an awful burden on those municipalities.

In our part of Ontario, the old Highway 2, which runs between the Quebec border and on through Toronto, is going to be dumped back on the municipality. They're very worried. It's probably going to cost \$15 million to upgrade. The province is going to come up with probably \$4 million or \$5 million, which will only —

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): We hope they do, John.

Mr Cleary: Well, they're supposed to. That's something they should look at very carefully and not download on the municipalities, because the municipalities have no more money either.

Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton): It's certainly a pleasure for me to speak briefly this afternoon on Bill 106. I am somewhat dismayed that the member for Kingston and The Islands, who was the former mayor of Kingston, would have the opinion he has on Bill 106, especially when we're talking about the business occupancy tax. I am sure as a former mayor he saw how difficult it was for his community to collect and how much money was lost by the community with regard to the business occupancy tax on small businesses. It's amazing how the mayor of Kingston, the member for —

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It's the member for Dovercourt who made the presentation, not the member for Kingston and The Islands. You meant the member for Dovercourt; is this what you meant? Did you mean the member for Dovercourt?

Mr Beaubien: I'll direct my other comments to the member for Dovercourt and I'll leave the member for Kingston and The Islands alone.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr Beaubien: It's amazing that the member for Dovercourt seems to play large businesses against small businesses. He's always looking after the underdog. But I remember that during the mandate of his government, his government spent \$1 billion a month more than it took in in revenues. This is a person who is concerned

about the small business operator. We wonder who made the banks rich during that period.

I would suggest that the member for Dovercourt is speaking from both corners of his mouth. I would also suggest that probably not too many people would buy a used car from this person. If he is so concerned about small businesses, why is it that his government saw fit to spend \$1 billion a month more, during the mandate of the former government of this province?

Mr Gerretsen: I appreciate the kind words from the member for Lambton, especially since I hadn't said anything today yet on this bill.

Mr O'Toole: Mr Speaker, point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Which of the standing orders are you referring to?

Mr O'Toole: Mr Speaker, if I may, in the rotation, the government side spoke, the opposition spoke, the third party —

The Deputy Speaker: No, we started by you, we went there, we went there, and now it's the turn here.

Would you make sure you start the clock at two minutes again? That is not a proper intervention. The member for Kingston and The Islands.

Mr Gerretsen: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I think the standing orders are quite clear that there are four opportunities for questions and answers in rotation, and if one of the parties doesn't happen to have any members get up at that time, then obviously the rotation continues.

1640

I believe in fairness of taxes. There's absolutely no question about that. That's what we should be about. We should be fair to all Ontarians. What we have found out from the task force we've had travelling the province and who made their report official today, from the Leader of the Opposition, Dalton McGuinty, and our finance critic, Gerry Phillips, is that Mike Harris's plan is fundamentally flawed. That's the conclusion we've come to. Over 300 people were interviewed on this plan and they all agreed that the \$5.4 billion you're taking off the property tax roll in education is not matched by the \$6.3 billion that in effect you're downloading on to municipalities.

Municipalities are going to have to raise more money locally. There are figures in this report that clearly indicate that in most municipalities the taxes are going to go up 10%, 15% to 20% if the same programs are to be delivered within the municipal sphere. Those are conclusions we came to. Many organizations felt that way. It is simply wrong.

Every study that's ever been done clearly indicates that you cannot download health care costs, social service costs and social housing on to the municipalities. The property tax base simply cannot react to that sufficiently. What it's going to mean is that Ontarian is going to be pitted against Ontarian, and this is something we in this party want to avoid, and this is something the government, if it gets all of its mega-legislation through, is going to foster in this province.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Dovercourt, you have two minutes to reply.

Mr Silipo: I appreciate the responses from both sides of the House. It seemed to me that at least from the

response I got particularly from the government side, from the members for Durham East and Lambton, that I had struck a little bit of a chord, and I think it's fair if we disagree. We clearly disagree in a very fundamental way. I'd say to the member for Durham East first of all that when he says there can't be more taxes, I agree with him. That's the point. There can't be more taxes, but at the same time you can't pretend that by doing this you're not increasing taxes. It's not as if you're saying that by removing the business occupancy tax you're somehow giving the municipalities the money to be able to find that. They're going to have to find it somewhere, and where are they going to find it? They're going to find it through increasing taxes.

The question becomes then, how are they going to increase those taxes, not whether but how? I say again to the member for Lambton, if he's really serious, as a member of his government, in supporting small business, then you don't hit small businesses where it's going to hurt them the most.

The reason I continue to talk about the differences between big business and small business is twofold. First of all it's because I agree with virtually every economist and every other commonsensical individual who has said and says that it's small business that by and large creates the jobs; and second, I believe that you can't say you believe in supporting small business and then whack them over the head with bigger tax increases while at the same time you're decreasing the business loads for those big businesses that don't create jobs in quite the same way as small businesses do.

I think, though, that what we're seeing from the government is consistency, because they would rather support those who are already better off instead of supporting the modest-means individuals and small businesses.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate.

Mr Jim Flaherty (Durham Centre): I am pleased to have the opportunity this afternoon to speak in support of Bill 106, the Fair Municipal Finance Act.

Major changes are needed in property tax assessment in Ontario, and that's the reason for this reform. There is an unsatisfactory situation that has festered in Ontario for many years in many communities, that assessments have not been kept up to date. The consequence of that is serious for many people: The values have gotten out of whack, they are out of date, and the distribution of the property tax burden becomes unfair. This is so not only in the city of Toronto, about which we hear a great deal, but also in my riding in the town of Whitby and in the city of Oshawa, where antiquated tax bases are being used, resulting in inequitable tax assessments in various parts of those communities.

The principle involved is that the properties of similar value should be assessed in a similar way and therefore taxed in a similar way in any given community. We have not had that system in about a third of the communities in Ontario in recent years. The goal, of course, is that Ontario needs a fair and consistent wide standard, a standard across the province, that is similar in similar communities on similar properties.

Many governments have had the opportunity to address this problem and to do something about it and have not

done it. Our government is facing the problem, as it has with a number of other difficult issues, and addressing it and doing something about it and fulfilling a commitment which was made to do so.

There are several concerns that have inhibited governments in the past from dealing with this difficult issue. One of them has been the difficulty that some seniors on fixed incomes, on low incomes, have in meeting assessments which might be increased if they live in homes, older homes as opposed to newer homes, post-Second World War homes in communities like Toronto and Whitby and Oshawa that are using very old assessment bases.

There is also the concern with persons with disabilities on low incomes and often on fixed incomes as well. Both of these concerns are addressed in the legislation, which gives the municipalities the opportunity to make provision for persons with disabilities and low-income seniors. This will take care of that serious concern that those persons would not be able to withstand any possible increases in their share of the property tax burden in the community.

The key is that the proposed bill provides that opportunity for municipalities, and I'm sure the municipalities will address that need since they're given that opportunity in this bill. Current value is the key, "current value" being defined in the act, and the act addresses the current value as the value of the property if it were sold, which avoids the difficulty which has been experienced in some places of properties being valued as if they could support a high-rise or whatever that is overvalued and the resulting assessment causing a tax assessment that is unwarranted on those particular properties. As I say, the mechanism used in the legislation is current value.

There are inequities in Toronto in particular, in Whitby and Oshawa and other communities. There are situations, for example, in Scarborough, and these are cited in the papers, of a couple paying \$3,400 in taxes on a property with a market value of \$227,000 and then a professional couple in the city of Toronto living in a home valued at \$1.8 million paying a property tax of \$3,750. So here, a few miles from each other, we have gross discrepancies in the amounts of property taxes being paid on properties of grossly different values. This is the type of result that this legislation corrects. It also means that the couple living in Scarborough is subsidizing the more expensive house in the city of Toronto and that the fair share is not being paid for the more expensive property. There are many other examples of that difficulty.

The bill addresses these problems in three ways.

First, it gets the assessments up to date by getting the assessments done now. Currently assessments are being updated on all properties province-wide. All properties will be valued in the same year — that is, as of June 30, 1996 — as recommended by Mr Crombie in his Who Does What commission.

Second, all properties in the province will be kept current with regular updates. This will avoid the problem that has festered over the past, and it's close to 50 years now in the province without being addressed, that assessments became grossly out of date.

Third, the assessments will be consistent across the province.

The three keys there are getting the assessments up to date, making sure they stay current and making sure they're consistent province-wide.

There is the specific problem which some have raised about fluctuations in the real estate market. There would be problems, for example, if we took the year 1988, when there was a real estate boom in full swing, and used that as the base year, because that would distort the market in later years. For that reason a year in which there was not a boom real estate market, 1996, was chosen as the evaluation year, the base year, and there is a three-year rolling average used to moderate changes from year to year. After a transition period, the annual assessment of properties will be based on the average value for the current year and the two previous years.

1650

There has also been a difficulty with homeowners and other property owners understanding the assessment system. We've all had the experience — I know I have — of receiving assessment notices and not being able to understand them: decimals being used, multiplied by a mill rate, arriving at an assessment and having to consult with others and even pay others to tell you what the assessment means on your own home.

One of the goals of this legislation is to make the new system understandable and also transparent so that a homeowner receiving an assessment will be able to read what the tax assessor says the current value of their home is. It'll be a plain figure. They'll be able to compare it with their neighbours, they'll be able to compare it with their perception of the value of their property, of that neighbourhood and that community, and that way we will have accomplished the reform of making the system understandable.

There's also an advantage here, finally, for rental apartment buildings. In almost all Ontario municipalities rental apartment buildings are taxed at least twice as heavily as single-family homes and condominiums. This is an increased burden on tenants that is passed on to them in their rents by the persons who own the building. The Fair Municipal Finance Act will give municipalities the power to ensure that rental properties are taxed at a fair rate. In addition, municipalities will be able to request a separate tax class for new rental apartment buildings with seven or more units, which will enable municipalities to tax these new buildings at a level comparable to owner-occupied condominiums or single-family homes. High property taxes have been an obstacle to investment and creation of new rental housing in the province and this bill will help address that difficulty.

I'll mention condominiums for a moment because it is an area in which I've been involved as the parliamentary assistant in Consumer and Commercial Relations over the past 20 months.

Many people in condominiums have appealed their tax assessments over the years. The condominium form of home ownership has been widespread for only about a generation in this province. Many of the condominiums have been experiencing an unfair tax burden in terms of the distribution in those communities that have not had updated assessments. I think people living in condominiums or who will own condominiums in the future will

appreciate this tax reform as moving towards fairness and equity for persons who own condominium units.

The practical effects of the new legislation in Ontario and in my area in Oshawa-Whitby will be that there will be a balancing out in the community so that persons in newer homes will no longer have a heavier tax burden proportionately than those who live in older homes in the community.

Appeals have always been a problem with respect to assessments, especially in recent years. The number of appeals, for example, in the city of Toronto have contributed to an erosion of the tax base. This unfairness in the system has led to appeals pushing up tax rates and making it more difficult for municipalities to pay for the services that residents want.

With respect to appeals, the new act, the bill which we're discussing today, streamlines the process and it also introduces a settlement process which should help resolve many of these disputes without the very substantial expenses which many property owners have had to incur when appealing assessments under the current system. The streamlining of the process of appeals provides that the Assessment Review Board will be restructured to create a single-tier assessment system, and as of 1998, the involvement of the Ontario Municipal Board as a level of assessment appeal will be eliminated. The act will require the taxpayer and assessor to try to resolve the matter before the Assessment Review Board becomes involved.

In the act, the scheme is set out so that initially someone unhappy with their assessment would file a request to the assessment commissioner to reconsider the assessment. The assessment commissioner would then be required — it's mandatory — to respond to and seek information from the property taxpayer. This is the sort of mandatory, conciliatory function which has proven very beneficial in all kinds of dispute resolution in the province of Ontario and I would hope would serve to resolve many of these disputes at an early stage and at very limited cost.

If the matter is not resolved at that early stage, then the appeal lies to the Assessment Review Board and there are the provisions which protect due process: the right to a hearing, the right of the parties to be heard and the hearing of evidence that the parties might want to hear. There's then the decision of the Assessment Review Board, and if there is a fundamental flaw in that decision, then there is the right to go to the Divisional Court of the Ontario Court (General Division) on a question of law, which would be the ultimate protection if there was an assessment that was for some reason in contravention of the law that will be set out in this act, if passed.

So that's the background with respect to assessment appeals, which for anybody involved in assessment appeals in the past in the province of Ontario will be viewed as a very important and money-saving reform.

In summary, this is a major change in property assessment in Ontario. It's long overdue. It will result in fair and equitable assessments. It is to be remembered that as a result of this new system, the property tax will only increase if it has been undervalued relative to similar properties, and that means that other property owners have been paying higher taxes to make up for the lower

taxes on those properties. The effect of outdated assessments has been, and this will be corrected, that some property owners have effectively been paying other property owners' shares of taxes.

Where property owners do question assessments under the new system under Bill 106, there will be simplified resolution procedures and assessment appeal procedures available. These are progressive steps towards constructive early dispute resolution under this beneficial legislation.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mr Gerretsen: I totally agree with the member. We should have a system that doesn't have any gross inequities and it should be a fair system, there's no question about it. Of course, the real question is whether or not any system that is based on any kind of market value or current value is really the way to go. Perhaps there's another way in which property taxes ought to be paid entirely.

But you know, where your system of so-called fairness totally falls down is in this notion of the downloading that you're doing on to municipalities right now. As I indicated before, we have just had a commission go through Ontario that talked to at least 130 people from all walks of life, many people who were involved in the municipal field, in the municipal service field etc, and they've all come to one conclusion. That conclusion is that you're downloading on to municipalities an extra \$1 billion worth of costs. You're downloading \$6.3 billion in areas where municipalities simply won't be able to cope. They will not be able to cope by taking over a much greater responsibility for social services costs, for health care costs, for social housing. Every study that's ever been done from the right or the left clearly indicates that these are not the kind of costs that should come out of a regressive tax system like the property tax system.

So, Mike Harris, your plan is fundamentally flawed, and that is the title of our document that was produced by our leader and Mr Phillips, who will be the next speaker on our side. He will be very qualified to talk about this subject, as we all know in this House. So why don't you do the right thing? Why don't you stop the downloading? Why don't you say, "Yes, we understand the people of Ontario don't want us to download social services, they don't want us to download social housing, they don't want us to download health care services on municipalities," and let's go to a system that is truly fair to the people of Ontario, a system that is truly revenue-neutral, as you like to say? Because what you're doing right now is adding \$1 billion to the property tax rolls of this province.

The Deputy Speaker: Time has expired, thank you.

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : Ce projet de loi, la Loi 106, est encore une autre indication où le gouvernement, petit à petit, pas à pas, est en train de s'organiser pour faire sûr que les communautés à travers la province ont de moins en moins le support nécessaire.

Un bon exemple, c'est l'hôpital Montfort. On regarde le gouvernement à l'autre bord aujourd'hui avec cette législation qu'ils veulent passer, et de quelle autre question ne traitent-ils pas ? C'est toute la question de ce qui se passe avec l'hôpital Montfort. Monsieur le Prési-

dent, il est important que le gouvernement — oui, c'est relié. Je veux dire que c'est important que le gouvernement reconnaisse qu'avec ses actions sous la Loi 106, ça veut dire que les municipalités vont avoir moins d'argent. C'est vrai, c'est ça dans la loi. Ce que ça veut dire aussi, c'est qu'à la fin de la journée, le gouvernement ne va pas avoir les dollars nécessaires afin de maintenir des services comme à l'hôpital Montfort. Ce n'est pas acceptable.

1700

The government tries to make us believe that this is all necessary in order for them to be able to organize themselves in some kind of way to be able to put the municipalities in a situation to deal with their downloading. Well, the reality is, no matter which way you cut it, what you guys are doing quite simply is absolving your responsibilities as a government and passing those responsibilities back down to the municipalities.

The sad, sad part about all of this is that the municipalities, through this act or through any act, are not going to have the ability to pay for those services that you're passing on to them. In the cities of Timmins, Toronto or Ottawa, wherever it might be, where are they going to find the dollars to be able to absorb the kinds of services you're passing on to them? Who's going to pay for ambulance services? Where are they going to get the dollars? Who will pay for social housing? Where are they going to get the dollars?

I think the government needs to reflect and look back and to say: "What is our role as a government? What is it that we should be doing?" I would argue that they should be doing what they were elected to do, and that is govern for the people of this province and not for themselves.

Mr O'Toole: I was going to share my time with another member of the caucus; however, I want to commend the member for Durham Centre for bringing to our attention, and that of the people watching today, the important changes in the assessment system in Ontario. The whole focus of the plan is fairness. It's not more taxes; it's about fairness.

I think you have to look at three parts. First, for my riding of Durham East it's very important to look at the treatment of the farm tax rebate, long overdue; Mr Gerretsen would know that. The member for Durham Centre has done an able, capable job of explaining it to the people, how 0.25% of the assessment, they'll just pay the bill now; there won't be this whole transaction of paperwork.

Another section there which I think is very good is section 372. I particularly like this. It allows a phasing in over an eight-year period, starting in 1998. What could be more sensible than allowing an eight-year phasing-in period? People have known about these inequities for years.

Another important part is for those people who may be on a fixed income. They could be people with disabilities, they could be senior citizens; in fact, they could be people just on low income, where as a result of the last 10 years of travesty, the economy's almost been killed. Section 373 allows for the deferral of taxes. I think if you take someone on a fixed income — and as we know, over the last two governments there have been 60-some

tax increases, almost all precipitated as a result of their overspending. They got on this diet of constantly increasing taxes. Of course that's not our mandate. As the member for Durham Centre has explained, we've allowed a phasing-in process and we've also allowed a deferral process for those people on fixed incomes. I think it is sensitive, I think it's balanced, and I think it's workable.

Of course the other two parties will oppose it. The member for Durham Centre has clearly made the argument that this is a fair tax system, long overdue, and I think this government should stand and applaud the actions of the minister.

Mr Bradley: I'm surprised by the member's speech, that it didn't mention a lot of the downloading, because one of the reasons we're into this particular piece of legislation is because of the downloading that's taking place. This was mentioned, of course, in the report that was put out by Gerry Phillips, who is the member for Scarborough-Agincourt and the critic in the field of economics and finance for the Ontario Liberal caucus. You will know that this report is one which is in great demand now, particularly by those who are elected at the local level. It's called *The Mike Harris Plan... "Fundamentally Flawed": Report of the Liberal Community Impact Review Committee*.

Of course, a lot of the people who spoke to us when we were out there — and Gerry was at many of the hearings, as was Dalton McGuinty — were people of all political backgrounds. I know the member, when he gets up, and he perhaps will be kind enough to mention some of the contents of this document — you're going to find out that people of all political affiliations are critical now of the downloading taking place.

Some of them thought, "Well, these people will be our friends," and they were initially pretty quiet, you see, because they were intimidated. Or they thought: "Well, maybe if we're quiet, we'll get a special favour out of the government. Maybe Mike Harris will be nice to us." And then what happens? They find out they get dumped upon; responsibilities they never believed they were going to get: long-term care, welfare, mother's allowance, ambulance service, a variety of responsibilities which have not been in the municipal domain as long as I can remember. Now they're confronted with these costs, and when they complain, the Premier of the province calls them whiners. I don't call them whiners. I think they're being very realistic.

Mr Flaherty: I listened with interest to the comments of the member for Kingston and The Islands and also his colleague in the benches opposite, in the official opposition, the member for St Catharines. They talked about downloading, they talked about other things, but they didn't talk about this Bill 106 and the reforms it addresses for property owners in Ontario. I don't know why they didn't address the bill. It may be that they're embarrassed because they had the reigns of government here for five years, from 1985 to 1990, and did not address this serious problem in Ontario, for whatever reasons. They must be embarrassed now that there's finally a government that's addressing the problem.

I listened also to the member from Cochrane. Similarly, he talked about hospitals and ambulance services,

which aren't mentioned in Bill 106, which is the reform of the property tax assessment system in Ontario. I don't know whether he agrees with the bill or not. He must agree with the bill because he didn't speak out against it when he had the opportunity to do so in reply. It may be also that he's embarrassed because he was here during those years, from 1990 to 1995, when his government had the opportunity to address this problem, which has existed in this province for many years and which is unfair to many homeowners in Ontario; not only unfair to many homeowners in Ontario of single-family residences but unfair to people who live in rental units, townhouses and apartments, and to people who live in condominiums and who rent units in condominium buildings in Ontario.

These are issues I would have thought the Liberal government, from 1985 to 1990, and the NDP government, from 1990 to 1995, would have addressed, because they constantly tell us how much they care about fair and equitable systems in the province. But it is left for our government once again to take care of the difficulty, face the problem, don't sweep it under the rug, address it and make sure that major reform is made. We keep our commitments.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I'd like to debate Bill 106, which I guess the public are aware is called An Act respecting the financing of local government.

I would say that it is impossible to disassociate ourselves on this bill from the downloading. I will absolutely guarantee for the people of Ontario what they're going to face when they see their new property tax bill in 1998. I will say to the government members, you'd better get yourselves ready for a firestorm. Why? Let me start with the fact that you are going to force the municipalities to introduce this property tax reform at the very moment that you are downloading \$1 billion of extra costs on to property tax. I might add that \$1 billion is going to mean just that: a 10% increase in property tax. As you want to bring in fairness and equity in property tax, you are adding \$1 billion of costs.

Who said that? The title of this is The Mike Harris Plan... "Fundamentally Flawed."

Mr Bradley: Who said that?

Mr Phillips: It was the regional chair of Hamilton-Wentworth, Mr Terry Cooke.

Mr Bradley: I thought it was a Tory.

Mr Phillips: I don't know his political background, but I do know Mr Cooke is well regarded in the province. He is regarded as one of the best municipal leaders in the province. Mike Harris personally picked him to be on the Who Does What committee. It was Mr Cooke, Mr Crombie and I guess 12 or 13 other people who looked at all of the disentanglement, where we should go in the province. Mike Harris hired him to do that or asked him to do that. I don't know whether he got money or not. I don't think they did; they did it out of community goodwill. But they took on the responsibility of trying to advise the government on what services should be put on the province and what services should be put on the municipality, and the government has chosen to totally

disregard that. You are adding, at the time this property tax reform comes in, \$1 billion of extra costs.

1710

Here is what Mr Cooke said: "In its present form" — the one that you are proceeding with — "the disentanglement process is fundamentally flawed. It will destabilize the financial viability especially of bigger urban areas and over the long haul my fear is, again, we will divide the province into a series of communities, some of which have and some of which have not."

He's but one of the voices that is saying you've made a huge mistake on this downloading. What did Mr Crombie say on it and the entire panel, who, I might add, were handpicked by Mr Harris, the Premier, to advise the government on the future of the province? As a matter of fact, government members have been walking around with binders called Who Does What. We have a series of bills that the government calls the Who Does What bills, and this is part of it. But what does Mr Crombie say about this and what does the panel say about it? Recognize, it was Crombie and his panel that the government charged with the responsibility to say what to do, and he says this about your downloading and about the moves to put social assistance and child care and long-term care — every senior in the province watching should be phoning their MPP and saying, "Don't do it." Here's what Mr Crombie said —

Mr Bradley: A former Tory cabinet minister.

Mr Phillips: A former Conservative cabinet minister of the federal government, a well-regarded individual. He says: "The panel strongly opposes such a move. We are unanimous" — it isn't just a number of the panelists, but the entire panel; I think there were 14 plus Mr Crombie — in the view that welfare and health should not be put on the property tax.

The reason I raise that is the government has chosen to head down a road that the Globe and Mail says editorially is a disaster. That's strong language, particularly for an editorial board. The Globe and Mail says it's a disaster. Virtually every paper in the province editorially says, "Don't do it." The board of trade says, "Don't do it."

As my colleagues have said, we were in 10 communities. We talked with over 200 individuals and unanimously, without exception — and these were people from every political stripe, community leaders — they said, "This is a huge mistake."

In the news today, Mr Crombie was begging the government to reconsider it. The United Way is begging the government to reconsider it. The municipalities are begging the government to reconsider it.

The reason I raise all of this is that at a time when you're trying to reform property tax, you've set a firestorm around the province. Surely we do not want to have the future wellbeing of our seniors dependent on property tax. You've chosen now to put 100% of social housing on property tax, and I might add that a majority of social housing in this province is seniors. That's who are in social housing, and you're putting 100% of that on property tax.

Long-term care: What could be more important to our future than long-term care? You're putting that on property tax.

Our young people: There are half a million young people in this province who rely on social assistance for their food and their clothing and their shelter, and that's going on property tax.

You cannot find one study, one group, one person who thinks this is the right move. It's a mistake. I know it's difficult to acknowledge a mistake, and I would find it understandable and acceptable if the government would say, "Listen, we were rushed. We realize that in our haste to get our agenda done we made a mistake and we are going to back up and change it." But it's got to change. It has to change.

I'm sorry, Mr Speaker, I should have indicated at the outset of my remarks that I believe there was all-party agreement that I would have 90 minutes for my remarks.

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr Phillips: I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr Bisson: Remember who supported you.

Mr Phillips: I appreciate that. I think all sides did and I appreciate the Conservative members doing that as well. I understand that I will finish by 6 o'clock, as the agreement is with the House.

The reason I raise this is that there are inequities in property tax around the province. Everybody knows that. There are, within communities, gross inequities between what people are paying on property taxes, and it has to be changed. But if you want to bring in change that the community can accept, you couldn't make a worse move than loading on to the property tax these services. As I say, I don't where the decision came from, I don't know how it was reached, but the very panel that was providing the expert advice fundamentally disagrees with it, and you will not find —

Mr O'Toole: Mr Speaker —

The Deputy Speaker: Is it a point of order?

Mr O'Toole: Yes, a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Please say so. Yes, a point of order.

Mr O'Toole: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of viewers that Mr Phillips, a well-respected financial commentator, is perhaps misleading — that's the wrong word; perhaps not being clear to those persons watching that the bill in discussion here is Bill 106, which is the fair assessment system and that has absolutely nothing —

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Please take your seat.

Mr Gerretsen: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member has accused the member who was speaking, Mr Phillips, of misleading this House. I believe that's unparliamentary language and I would ask you to ask him to withdraw that remark, Mr Speaker. He said that the speaker was misleading, which of course he was not.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. I was just about to make a point of the comment of the member for Durham East. I don't see anything really offensive in what he has said. I think he corrected himself immediately.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: No, he made a mistake and corrected himself. That's the way I saw it. To continue on the debate —

Mr Bisson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know it's hard for some of the political neophytes in the Conservative Party, but when they do get up in the House, they're not supposed to refer to the member by name but by riding. I believe he did refer to the member by name.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, we heard that from the member here a minute ago, so I'm sure everybody will abide by the rules and the Speaker won't have to get up too often so that I have to interrupt the speaker. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

Mr Phillips: Just to continue on what I think the public wants to know, there is no doubt that the government, as it's introducing this bill and as property taxpayers are going to be trying to deal with the changes, let's recognize that the government has chosen to put the most vulnerable services — our seniors' services, our children's services — on to property taxes. You can imagine the battle. You can imagine, as property taxpayers are faced with the implications of this bill, how they are now going to recognize that they are going to be in a battle with seniors who need services, with children who need services. I think it's absolutely essential that we put that in the context of this bill.

I will talk a little bit about the bill. Let's recognize this: The government has said, "We are eliminating the business occupancy tax." That's part of this bill. For municipalities around this province, that is \$1.6 billion — it's gone. The government very nicely said, "We are eliminating that tax." Of course, what it means is the government doesn't lose one cent of revenue. It is our hard-pressed municipalities that lose \$1.6-billion worth of revenue, at the same time, by the way, as the government is downloading, dumping seniors, children, child care, social housing, ambulance care, health care, all on the property tax. What's the municipality going to do? How is the municipality going to make up the \$1.6 billion of lost revenue? The government just says: "You do whatever you want to do. Add it back on to the other property taxpayers."

1720

I would say the first question that people listening and watching this should ask themselves on Bill 106 is: "Wait a minute. The business occupancy tax, \$1.6 billion of revenue, is gone. Who is going to pick it up?" The government says the municipalities will simply have to add it on to the remaining taxpayers. Who is going to get it? Is it going to be the business community? If it is, there are going to be some who will be looking at tax hikes. If it all goes back on the commercial and industrial, the tax hike is around 40%. So for those people out in the business community listening to this, you'd better start looking at the bill. Some of you will be looking at tax increases of 40%, because the business occupancy tax will be put on you, or is it going to go on to the residential property taxpayer?

I listened very carefully to the government members talking about this bill and talking about the good aspects of it, relieving taxes on business, relieving taxes on apartments, relieving taxes on people who have been paying too much. Yes, all of those things are part of the bill. But recognize this: This is, as they say out there, a

zero sum game. The municipalities to survive, to pay the bills, are going to need to raise the same amount of money.

Everybody who's listening to this, the government is saying the business community will pay less, the business occupancy tax gone — \$1.6 billion, 11% of the revenue, and in some municipalities it's like 15% of the revenue — apartments paying less, according to the government, it doesn't take very long before you recognize that the single-family, residential property taxpayer in the province is going to pay substantially more, and this is coming like a freight train, because this happens all next year, 1998.

I might add that we've met with the Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers, who have advised us of their real concerns about the actual implementation of this. They're the ones who will be charged with the responsibility of getting the tax bills out and they're saying to us, and I assume they're saying to the government, they've got real concerns about getting this thing done in time. As I say, if I were a government member I would be saying to the cabinet, "Give me some idea of what this is going to mean to my residential property taxpayers."

I might add, Mr Speaker, that, as you know, we have asked under freedom of information for the government to release its impact studies on this. The government refused to do it. We then, as you recall, moved a resolution in the House, supported by the NDP, to have the government release the impact studies. The government has got studies. The government knows what this is going to mean to residential property taxpayers. But for whatever reason, the Conservative back bench voted it down.

I would say to them, you should find out what this is going to mean to residential property taxpayers because there is no doubt the elements of the bill are there: Move more property taxes on to the single-family, residential property taxpayers. You add that on top of the very serious downloading, dumping — what Mr Cooke, the regional chair of Hamilton-Wentworth, called a fundamentally flawed process of dumping the costs on to them — and you've got the ingredients, as I say, of a firestorm. Make no mistake about that.

When we look at the bill we say that yes, property tax reform is essential. But if you wanted to devise a plan where you create chaos around introduction of property tax reform, you do what the government's doing. First off you download substantially on to the municipalities. You then get an environment where there is massive restructuring going on around the province, and much of it unwanted.

I found it mildly amusing when the last government member spoke and said, "We're just doing what we said we would do." I wish that were true. I don't remember any time during the campaign Mike Harris saying, "I'm going to put seniors' services, social housing, long-term care on to property tax." I guarantee you that if he had said that in my riding, there would have been intense anger.

Mr Gerretsen: That's putting it nicely.

Mr Phillips: It's putting it nicely, as my colleague said. Can't we all agree that as we look ahead in this

province, as our senior community is aging and having spent a lifetime contributing to the province — surely we're not going to cut them adrift and say, "Your services are now completely dependent on the property tax."

You can absolutely guarantee in the year ahead, as council after council have their backs to the wall, the inevitable battles that will take place. When you say you're keeping your promise, have you ever hinted that Mike Harris had that plan?

Even in Metro Toronto, I must say, in my community there's intense anger at Mr Harris because before the election there was something called the Mike Harris Metro task force. It was chaired by a former mayor of Scarborough, but there were Al Leach, Derwyn Shea and Mr Kells as vice-chairs. I remember very clearly, because if anybody had proposed getting rid of Scarborough or the city of Toronto or Etobicoke or North York and amalgamating, I don't think there would have been a Conservative member elected.

In fact what this report said was the opposite. It said that the Metro level of government will be eliminated. That was the major recommendation of the Mike Harris task force. It goes on to say, "The present number of six local governments will be retained."

It goes on to say in this report, "Beware of so-called false economies of scale in which smaller operations are subsumed into larger ones for the sake of efficiency but soon bogged by the growth of bureaucracy."

The reason I raise that is if the government members wonder why there is so much anger out there around the megacity, it is because fundamentally the people of Metropolitan Toronto disagree with it, but also because before the election it was very clear where Mike Harris stood on it, "We're going to keep those six municipalities," and I assure you it helped in the election. Had he said then what he's doing now, there would not have been one Conservative member elected in Metropolitan Toronto.

I raise that because this bill without doubt — and the government is fond of saying it — is all part of the package. It's all part of the Who Does What package. It's all part of our total plan for Ontario. We're now finding out that the plan has many flaws and that's why people now — I urge you to begin to take a look at Bill 106 and get involved in it. I might add that there are a few organizations around the province that are now beginning to get involved.

I suspect I'm like most members; I've had relatively little comment so far on the bill. The clerks and treasurers did meet with us. They of course are aware of it.

1730

I might say that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is one of the first business groups to look at the bill, and I'm not surprised at that, because it tends to be an organization that has its finger on the pulse of things. Certainly here in Ontario my experience with them has been that they are a very professional organization, very non-partisan, very matter of fact and very factual. They've begun to look at the bill, as I say, early on and they're doing their usual good work, but they're starting to raise concerns.

I'm urging the public to begin to take a look at this bill. The timing on it is that today we will finish with what's called second reading. The bill will pass this Legislature on second reading, approval in principle. We then will go to public hearings, I gather, in two weeks, in April; four days probably here at Queen's Park and four days in the province. Then it will come back for final approval in late April or early May. The clock is running on this, and I can assure you that this is going to have a profound impact on every community in Ontario and a huge impact on some communities.

To review the important elements of the bill, I'd say, firstly, the business occupancy tax is generally regarded as an inappropriate tax. I don't think there are many who would defend that staying around. The problem, though, is the government has washed its hands of any responsibility for helping to get rid of it. It has simply said: "It's gone. Now, as usual, mayors and reeves, regional chairs, councillors, you do the dirty work. We're going to take the pat on the back for telling the business community we're taking \$1.6 billion off. Now you add it back on to your existing property taxpayers."

Similarly on the farm tax rebate for our farm community, farm land now will be assessed at 25% of its value, and that's fine. The problem is, who pays for that? The government gets the pats on the back from the farm community, but 100% of the cost of this is picked up by the local municipalities and the property taxpayers there. The cost just of that move alone — the province, as I say, has washed its hands of it — is \$165 million of new cost on to municipalities. In our travels the communities were saying: "This is a huge cost to us. I'm not sure how we're going to handle it."

Earlier on in the debate one of the government members said it was sort of like: "Here's a gift for you. You can now do your own assessment." That's \$120 million of new cost for municipalities. The farm land provision in the bill I completely understand, but as part of this downloading on to municipalities — and believe me, it is \$1 billion of extra cost — the province has simply wiped its hands of it and said, "It's over to you now, municipalities," and you're going to find municipalities now behind the eight ball in terms of property taxes or trying to cut services.

There is no doubt that we are going to see huge shifts in what individuals pay on property taxes, particularly in those areas that have not been reassessed for some time. Again, the problem here is there is no help for the municipalities in transition funds. A move of this magnitude has to be done sensitively, carefully and with some help from the province. But the province has wiped its hands of this thing, said, "It's all up to you, municipalities, now." They've burdened municipalities with those two things — I keep reminding us of it — \$1 billion of extra costs, well documented from community leaders around the province, and \$1.6 billion because of the business occupancy tax.

It's a bit like saying to some of our mayors and reeves, "All right, you go out and do battle," and then tying both their hands behind their back in terms of how they can effectively deal with this by burdening them with enormous extra costs. I can guarantee — and one of the

advantages of Hansard is that what we say is recorded, and we can use it again a year from now. It will be about a year from now when those tax bills start going out. There will be some whose taxes will go down as a result of the bill; there's no question of that. But our mayors and municipal leaders won't be thanked because of that; it will be all of those who face suddenly a huge new tax burden.

Recognize what the government members have said to us: "We are shifting taxes, business to residential, apartments to single-family residential. We're adding \$1 billion of new cost and the business occupancy tax." If you want to put together a recipe for tension and conflict out there, this is it.

Mr Gerretsen: This is the way to do it.

Mr Phillips: This is the way to do it, as my colleague said.

A little-known fact in the property tax reform as well is that education, the government tells us, is coming off the residential property taxpayer but it's staying on all of the business property taxpayers. The business community must be saying to themselves: "Wait a minute. You're leaving education on the business property taxpayer, you are encouraging the municipalities to put the bulk of the business occupancy tax back on the commercial-industrial property taxpayer, you are adding all of these extra costs on to the residential property taxpayer. I thought this was about finding a way that our businesses paid less taxes, not more taxes." But no, all of those things are going on.

My background is business, as probably is that of many in the Legislature. I ran three companies. I had 300 employees. I worked with a lot of very large companies. I've never seen major organizations that ever attempted to implement this broad a program, as the government is attempting to do. I think the public are beginning to appreciate, and certainly the government members are appreciating, we are dealing with 12 or 13 major bills in the House right now. There are all the Who Does What bills, then there's a series of red tape bills, there is the fire services bill, there is the development charges bill.

Increasingly it's clear to us in the opposition — I don't know how the back bench feel about it — this thing has not been very well thought through. There's a growing sense that the government simply hasn't had time to put it together properly. The proof of that was I guess in Bill 103, on the municipalities, the amalgamation, where the government was found by the courts to have acted illegally in its appointment of the trustees, where the Speaker ruled, in a difficult ruling for him, that there was, to use his language, a *prima facie* case of contempt of the Legislature because the government was proceeding as if the bill were passed. It is 100% clear that the decision to download these social services was a mistake. It could only have happened by a mistake being made somewhere in some ministry and not being caught by whoever should catch these things.

1740

The reason I raise all of this is that the bill on property tax reform in and of itself is a crucial issue that needs to be managed extremely well. It's one where there should be broad consultation, where there should be broad hearings on it and where there should be ample opportu-

ity for input and ample opportunity for effective implementation.

My understanding is that right now around the province there are I guess hundreds of people with virtually no training — a one-day training course, I understand — doing the assessments. The people who have responsibility for implementing it are saying to the government: "We don't think it can be done. We think that you have not got a proper timetable here." The debate will all be over, this thing will be finished, complete, law, some time in early May, if not late April.

I can assure you that Ontario has not yet woken up to what this is all about. When they do — I'll tell you what makes people very angry about governments. There are two things: one, if you lie to them; the second, if you treat them with arrogance. If you think that they are simply going to accept, "This bill went through very quickly; you must have been asleep," Ontario is not asleep. But what has happened is what I call planned confusion. I've said for months 1997 will be a year of what I call planned confusion. The government is going to try and get introduced and implemented a huge range of things before anybody can catch their breath.

I must say that Metropolitan Toronto caught their breath with Bill 103 on amalgamation, which was introduced on December 17. The community mobilized itself, and it was a grass-roots community activity, and spoke loud and clear to the government. By the way, I think the downloading, as my leader said earlier today, has that same potential when seniors realize that their services, their home services, their housing, their nursing homes are going to be on the backs of property taxes. They have spent a lifetime contributing to Ontario and now at a time when they should be feeling comfortable about life, what could be more uncertain than community after community being dependent on property taxes to provide services for seniors. We are only beginning to see the community beginning to let its voice be heard.

Certainly, when we went around the province, there's anger building. If you read the comments of Mr Crombie, who was supposed to have been the architect of all these things we're dealing with, saying today that — I forget the words he used; I could find them perhaps, if I try and flip through this quickly. I hadn't planned to raise this — but Mr Crombie today raising his voice about the downloading and trying to get the government to rethink it and to spend some time going back over his recommendations because he spent, along with his group, a considerable period of time. I may not be able to lay my hands on it right now, but I can assure you Mr Crombie in today's paper was raising major concerns about the downloading.

On top of that now, we've got this bill, Bill 106, that will change property taxes for everybody. We don't even know, as we're asked to deal with this, how the government is going to handle education tax on businesses. That should be part of what we're involved in here because many businesses in Ontario — actually when I talked to business people they thought education had come off property taxes. I said, "Whoa, it's still on your business." When they ask me, "How's that going to be handled?" and I say, "The government hasn't told us yet," and this still does not spell it out.

But I can tell you the government is going to demand from the business community the same amount of money — maybe more, but certainly the same amount of money and I suspect with some escalator — they're going to demand from the business community that they pay the same amount of money for education as they paid in the past on property taxes and the municipalities are going to have to add substantial costs on to make up for the business occupancy tax.

I raise those things because there is a growing sense out there that the government is out of control. Even people who previously have been supporting them are saying to me, "They're going too far, too fast." I have stronger language around that, but that's what many are saying. Furthermore, this stuff is not very well put together. Somebody over there isn't thinking. Somebody is letting this stuff get out and it's wrong. The biggest example is just who there ever said we should put long-term care on the property taxes. If I were the government, I would want that person at caucus and I would let them know exactly what I thought of that. That is the most retrogressive move imaginable.

If all of this were working, if this Harris plan were working, perhaps people might feel less angry about what's happening. But I keep saying to us and to the government that all of this Who Does What work and all of the work you've been doing was supposed to mean that we ended up with more jobs. It was supposed to mean that Ontario was going to be seeing jobs created at an enormous clip.

I have here the latest government report on jobs. You can see in this document 7,000 jobs lost in January. I think what we've seen in the last five months is 37,000 fewer jobs in Ontario, and I might say that job performance is a disaster. The government had said we would see jobs created at the rate of 12,000 a month. We should have seen 60,000 new jobs over the last five months. We've lost 37,000 jobs. Something has gone wrong with the Common Sense Revolution. The rest of Canada has gained 72,000 jobs.

Mr Gerretsen: It's not making common sense.

Mr Phillips: As my colleague says, it's not making common sense. I personally believe that the job situation is perhaps one of our most tragic situations in Ontario, one of the most serious problems, and the biggest problem is that the government will not even acknowledge there is a problem. I raised the issue the other day in the House and the Premier essentially dismissed it, like there is no problem.

Well, there is a problem. There's a problem with 37,000 fewer jobs. There are more people out of work in Ontario right now than when Mike Harris became Premier. The day Mike Harris became Premier, there were 499,000 people out of work, just under 500,000. At the end of January there were 529,000 out of work, another 30,000 people out of work. These are government figures: 30,000 more people out of work in Ontario now than when Mike Harris became Premier. I think that's important for the public and for all of us to understand. It's like: "Those people on social assistance have got to get out and get a job. That's the problem. They just have

to go out and work." Well, it's not that easy when there are 30,000 more people out of work now than when Mike Harris became Premier.

1750

I will say to all of us that the most tragic unemployment situation is our young people. The unemployment rate in January in Ontario was 18.6% for our young people. As this document, the government's document, says: "In January 1997 the Ontario youth unemployment rate was 18.6%, up 2.3 percentage points from January of last year." In one year, up 2.3%.

The reason I raise this issue is that we will not even begin to solve the problem as long as Mike Harris says there is no problem. That's the biggest mistake. In government, I suppose it's convenient to say: "That's a problem that's going away. We're solving it." But I will say to the Premier and to the government that we won't let this go. We think this is an issue that isn't being solved: 30,000 more people out of work now than when the government came into office.

We saw 35,000 full-time jobs created in 1996. That's the worst full-time job performance in four years. There is a problem with employment out there and the problem is not being solved.

The employment numbers for February come out this Friday. I happen to think we should see a substantial increase in the number of jobs. You cannot go on losing jobs. The economy has to begin to produce some jobs, and I fully expect that to be the case on Friday, but it will not begin to make up for the lost jobs over the last five months.

We are about to head into a period of what I call a chill in the economy. I was very sorry to see the situation at Eaton's. They're an institution in Canada. I suspect they will be fine. They will restructure themselves and be fine. But over the next few months as the government proceeds with its plan to close a third of the hospitals in this province, as school boards lay off people, as municipalities lay off people, the climate that is out there right now is one of fear and concern. In an environment like that, you don't spend your money, you worry about your future, and that's the climate that is being created out there.

As we put all of these bills into perspective — and I think we do have to look at it as a package; certainly the government members talk about it as a package. We are putting at risk a job that has to be done: property tax reform. We might as well have thrown some gasoline on this thing and thrown a match on it.

Many of my colleagues here are former municipal politicians. They've dealt with this issue. My colleague from Kingston, in addition to being the mayor of Kingston was also the president of AMO, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. He dealt with property tax reform in his community, a very difficult issue at the best of times. He talks to me about the election held shortly after it took place, and a very angry community. That is part and parcel of property tax reform, but the last thing you want to do when you are trying to help municipalities to implement that is to throw additional problems at them such as the business occupancy tax, the downloading and

the direction to move taxes off certain groups and on to other groups. That's why I raise these other issues, because all of us want property tax reform.

I'm looking for direction. My colleague has just indicated about two minutes before we wrap up — not you, Mr Speaker, but one of my colleagues. I'll respect that and look for a signal from my colleague.

On this bill, for Ontario I would urge the community to get involved in it and look at its implications. We are on a very short time frame on this. In a matter of quite literally minutes we will be finished debate on it here in the Legislature. It will then go out to committee for eight days in mid-April and then come back for final approval. It'll be gone. Then Ontario will have to live with the implications of all these changes, and they are dramatic. In our opinion there are things the government should be doing to assist the municipalities in implementing property tax reform. That's completely absent from this bill, and it shouldn't be, because you are leaving them out on a limb from which they will be cut off because of the emotion involved in property tax reform.

That concludes my remarks on Bill 106. I look forward to the public hearings on it.

Mr Gerretsen: You can keep talking.

Mr Phillips: I'm told that I'm not quite concluded. I was, but I gather I should perhaps speak for another couple of minutes about the bill.

Mr Gary L. Leadston (Kitchener-Wilmot): Time.

Mr Phillips: Yes, I know it's time, but my colleague says to keep talking.

In all seriousness, I know the government wants to proceed with property tax reform and I understand that. I just think the mistake you are making here is that you have put this into an environment that's polluted. You've put it into an environment where the mayors will be unable to effectively implement it. You're putting it in an environment where you have decided you're going to cut \$1.6 billion of revenue out and tell them to redistribute it. You have handcuffed them in terms of effective implementation. Even within the bill I will say there are some significant questions that Ontario wants to participate in the debate on. There are some unanswered questions around what is going to happen to education property taxes for businesses, and that's going to have to be answered at committee.

With that, we look forward to a participation by the public in our committee hearings on the bill. I would just say to Ontario, get ready because increased property taxes for many of you will be a way of life in 1998.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments? Further debate?

Mr Eves has moved second reading of Bill 106, An Act respecting the financing of local government. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Mr Ed Doyle (Wentworth East): Mr Speaker, I understand that we have unanimous consent for a vote deferral until after question period tomorrow.

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1800.

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Administration of justice / Administration de la justice

Chair / Président: Gerry Martiniuk
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ron Johnson
Robert Chiarelli, David Christopherson,
Bruce Crozier, Ed Doyle, Garry J. Guzzo,
Tim Hudak, Ron Johnson, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,
Gary L. Leadston, Gerry Martiniuk,
John L. Parker, David Ramsay, David Tilson
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Rick Bartolucci
Toby Barrett, Rick Bartolucci, Gilles Bisson,
Jim Brown, Michael A. Brown, John C. Cleary,
Morley Kells, Gerard Kennedy, Frances Lankin,
Allan K. McLean, E.J. Douglas Rollins, Frank Sheehan,
Bill Vankoughnet, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Finance and economic affairs /
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Ted Chudleigh
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tim Hudak
Isabel Bassett, Jim Brown, Ted Chudleigh,
Joseph Cordiano, Douglas B. Ford, Tim Hudak,
Monte Kwinter, Tony Martin, Gerry Martiniuk,
Gerry Phillips, Gilles Pouliot, E.J. Douglas Rollins,
Joseph Spina, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Bart Maves
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Mike Colle, Harry Danford, Jim Flaherty,
Michael Gravelle, Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese,
Bart Maves, Julia Munro, Lillian Ross,
Mario Sergio, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
Len Wood, Terence H. Young
Clerk / Greffière: Lynn Mellor

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Floyd Laughren
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony Silipo
Rick Bartolucci, Ed Doyle, Douglas B. Ford,
Gary Fox, Michael Gravelle, Bert Johnson,
Peter Kormos, Floyd Laughren, Gary L. Leadston,
Frank Michash, Dan Newman, Peter L. Preston,
Tony Silipo, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Ted Arnott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John Hastings
Ted Arnott, Dave Boushy, Tony Clement,
Kevin Curling, Carl DeFaria, Bill Grimmett,
John Hastings, Ron Johnson, Margaret Marland,
Gilles E. Morin, Sandra Papatello, Tony Silipo,
R. Gary Stewart, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Ombudsman

Chair / Président: John L. Parker
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tom Froese
Carl DeFaria, Barbara Fisher, Tom Froese, Pat Hoy,
W. Leo Jordan, Jean-Marc Lalonde, Rosario Marchese,
Bill Murdoch, John R. O'Toole, John L. Parker,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart, Bill Vankoughnet,
Len Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: Bernard Grandmaître
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Richard Patten
Marcel Beaubien, Dave Boushy, Gary Carr, Brenda Elliott,
Gary Fox, Bernard Grandmaître, John Hastings,
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Shelley Martel, Richard Patten,
Gilles Pouliot, Sandra Papatello, Derwyn Shea, Toni
Skarica
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Smith
Ted Arnott, Toby Barrett, Gilles Bisson, Dave Boushy,
John Gerretsen, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
Gerard Kennedy, Tony Martin, Trevor Pettit,
Lillian Ross, Tony Ruprecht, Frank Sheehan, Bruce Smith
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

**Resources development /
Développement des ressources**

Chair / Président: Brenda Elliott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Barbara Fisher
Dominic Agostino, John R. Baird, David Christopherson,
Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Sean G. Conway,
Brenda Elliott, Barbara Fisher, Doug Galt, Pat Hoy,
Bart Maves, John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette,
Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker

Social development / Affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Annamarie Castrilli
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Dwight Duncan
Marion Boyd, Elinor Caplan, Jack Carroll,
Annamarie Castrilli, Dwight Duncan, Tom Froese,
Helen Johns, W. Leo Jordan, Lyn McLeod,
Julia Munro, Trevor Pettit, Peter L. Preston,
Bruce Smith, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

CONTENTS

Wednesday 5 March 1997

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Hospital restructuring	
Mr Kennedy	7389
Mr Jordan	7391
French-language hospital services	
Mr Len Wood	7389
Atherley Bridge	
Mr McLean	7389
Niagara Escarpment Commission	
Mr Bradley	7390
National Grocers	
Mr Martin	7390
Glaxo Wellcome	
Mrs Johns	7390
Youth employment programs	
Mrs Papatello	7390
Government services	
Mr Bisson	7391

ORAL QUESTIONS

French-language hospital services	
Mr McGuinty	7393
Mr Wilson	7393
Property taxation	
Mr McGuinty	7394
Mr David Johnson	7394
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Hampton	7395
Mr David Johnson	7395
Hospital staff	
Mr Hampton	7396
Mr Wilson	7396
Hospital financing	
Mr Kennedy	7397
Mr Wilson	7397
Niagara Escarpment Commission	
Mr Hampton	7397
Mr Hodgson	7397
Young offenders	
Mr Jim Brown	7398
Mr Harnick	7398
Hospital restructuring	
Mr Patten	7398
Mr Wilson	7399
Mrs Boyd	7399
Ontario Human Rights Commission	
Mr Martiniuk	7400
Ms Mushinski	7400
Labour dispute	
Mr Miclash	7400
Mrs Witmer	7400

Ontario Ranger program

Ms Martel	7401
Mr Hodgson	7401

MOTIONS

Committee sittings	
Mr David Johnson	7402
Agreed to	7402

PETITIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr Sergio	7402
Mr Ramsay	7404
French-language hospital services	
Mr Len Wood	7402
Fire safety	
Mr Froese	7402
Mr Rollins	7403
Mr Christopherson	7404
Mr Martiniuk	7405
Occupational health and safety	
Mr Christopherson	7403, 7405
Ms Lankin	7403
Private member's motion	
Mr O'Toole	7404
Hospital financing	
Mrs Fisher	7404
TVOntario	
Mr Gravelle	7404
North York Branson Hospital	
Mr Kwinter	7405

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on government agencies	
Mr Silipo	7405
Report deemed adopted	7405
Standing committee on estimates	
Mr Kennedy	7405
Report presented	7405

SECOND READINGS

Local Control of Public Libraries Act, 1997, Bill 109, Ms Mushinski	
Agreed to	7405

Fair Municipal Finance Act, 1997,

Bill 106, Mr Eves	
Mr Bradley	7406, 7410, 7418
Mr Silipo	7408, 7410, 7415
Mr Murdoch	7409
Mr Miclash	7409
Mr Pouliot	7409
Mr O'Toole	7414, 7418
Mr Cleary	7414
Mr Beaubien	7414
Mr Gerretsen	7415, 7417
Mr Flaherty	7415, 7418
Mr Bisson	7417
Mr Phillips	7418
Vote deferred	7424

OTHER BUSINESS

Easter Seal Society	
Mrs Ecker	7391
Mrs Papatello	7391
Ms Lankin	7392
Written questions	
Mrs Boyd	7401
The Speaker	7402

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 5 mars 1997

PÉTITIONS

Services en français aux hôpitaux	
M. Len Wood	7402
M. Morin	7403
Bibliothèques publiques	
M. Lalonde	7403

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 1997 sur le contrôle local des bibliothèques publiques, projet de loi 109, M^{me} Mushinski	
Adoptée	7405
Loi de 1997 sur le financement équitable des municipalités, projet de loi 106, M. Eves	
M. Bisson	7417
Vote différé	7424

A200
C1
D23



No. 174

N° 174

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Thursday 6 March 1997

Jeudi 6 mars 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 6 March 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 6 mars 1997

*The House met at 1003.
Prayers.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

AUDIT AMENDMENT ACT, 1996 LOI DE 1996 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA VÉRIFICATION DES COMPTES PUBLICS

Mr Grandmaître moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Audit Act / Projet de loi 74, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la vérification des comptes publics.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Pursuant to standing order 96(c), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East): My amendment to the Audit Act is a very simple one and I think will certainly help the government of Ontario to be more open with the public and bring about a better understanding of what this government is trying to do.

My bill simply amends the Audit Act to allow the Provincial Auditor to present the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly with up to three reports per year in addition to his or her annual report. The auditor retains the power to submit special reports to the Speaker when he or she believes that a matter is urgent.

My bill was first introduced on June 12, 1996, and the reason, as I said, was a very simple one: People are asking our governments at all levels — municipal, provincial, federal — to be more accountable. Every day, every minister who stands in this House promoting his or her business plans also uses the word "accountability." They want people to better understand what this government is doing.

This government, since taking power in 1995, has brought about some major changes, such as Bill 26, which gives the government more powers, and also creating partnerships. I agree with partnerships; I think these partnerships should be open. In other words, is the government really responding to the needs of the people when they create these partnerships? A partnership, as far as I'm concerned, is 50-50, not 80-20.

My bill will give the Provincial Auditor the possibility to look at these new programs, look at these partnerships and make sure that these services promised by the government are good services, good-quality services. As I said, major changes have been brought about — fewer school boards and transfer of responsibilities and sharing of these responsibilities.

As you know, a group of my colleagues went out soliciting people's thoughts on the changes announced in mega-week, and mayor after mayor, citizen after citizen is questioning why the government is doing this. I think this is a golden opportunity for the government to approve this bill this morning and to provide the Provincial Auditor with more leeway so he can look at these programs and offer quality services — and is the government keeping its promise? What is the response of these agencies that have to share the services?

What my bill does is amend the Audit Act. The present Audit Act, or subsection 12(1), reads this way: "The Auditor shall report annually to the Speaker of the Assembly after each fiscal year is closed and the public accounts are laid before the assembly, but not later than the 31st day of December in each year unless the public accounts are not laid before the assembly by that day, and may make a special report to the Speaker at any time on any matter that in the opinion of the auditor should not be deferred until the annual report, and the Speaker shall lay each such report before the assembly forthwith if it is in session or, if not, not later than the 10th day of the next session."

My amendment simply says that subsection 12(1) will now read as follows: "12.1(1) The auditor may, in addition to any special report made under subsection 12.2, make a maximum of three additional reports in any year to the Speaker."

I had the opportunity to discuss this amendment with the Provincial Auditor and he agrees with me that he would like to have the opportunity to table more reports. At the present time he can table more reports if he wishes to, but with this amendment at least three reports per year. Being Chair of public accounts — when ministry after ministry appears before our committee, the auditor is questioning the dollars and cents that are being spent by these ministries. The auditor wants more clarity on whether the people of Ontario are getting a fair return for their tax dollars.

I think what's happening in Ontario, especially in health care — I can recall that the Ministry of Health had a difficult time answering some of the questions, but as usual the ministries, the deputy ministers, want to cooperate with the government, with the auditor, and bring about a better understanding of the delivery of quality services.

1010

Only last week we were looking at psychiatric hospitals and the services provided by psychiatric hospitals in Ontario. We had before us very special people who deliver these services who at the same time gave the government a very special message, "We need dollars; we

need the expertise," and they're asking the government to respond.

I think the government is serious when it says it wants to make some major changes not only to our school boards but to our municipal governments and health care, and it's a golden opportunity for the members of the government to support my bill and give the auditor the opportunity to look at these services.

This bill was copied, I must admit, from a federal bill which was introduced by the today sénateur Jean-Robert Gauthier seven or eight years ago, and it was passed in the House. I am told that the Auditor General at the federal level has no qualms about it, that it's working out well and he's tabling at least three reports per year. I'm asking the members of this House to support my bill and give the Provincial Auditor that power.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I'm happy to stand in the House today and support my honourable colleague's private member's bill for second reading. I listened carefully to his remarks today. I think, given the kinds of changes that are happening so rapidly in our province as this government downsizes, closes hospitals, amalgamates — which are changing the very face of our society very rapidly without that much public consultation, in fact I would say minimum public consultation — that it's all the more important that we have an opportunity to hear from the auditor more frequently. The auditor plays an extremely important role in making public and scrutinizing very carefully how the government is spending taxpayers' dollars and making public what he or she — in this case he — finds.

I've had occasion in the past year or so to examine the auditor's reports very carefully, and when I was in government as well. I agree, having been a cabinet minister in government, there are times when the auditor's report comes out and every department quakes a little bit: "What are they going to say about me? What are they going to say about my ministry?" Despite that, I believe that the auditor's report is extremely important in making ministers and their departments, their ADMs, their deputy ministers, everybody accountable to the public because that's the role they play.

The partisan politics that goes on within this place is well expected, but the auditor, I like to think, is always above and beyond that partisan politics and tells it like it is. I would say that some of the comments that, for instance, the auditor has made over the last year or so about what's going on within the Ministry of Environment have been very important. I think the public will pay more attention sometimes to what a neutral body, a neutral person has to say about the expenditures and controls and how the taxpayers' money is being spent than they might sometimes to the partisan opposition.

When I read the auditor's report the last time and saw some of the cautions this auditor was making in terms of what's going on within the Ministry of Environment — I'm dwelling on that, of course, because I'm a critic in that area and have great concerns about the downsizing and the cutting and the deregulation that's going on within that ministry. The auditor has pointed out some very, very important gaps within the existing mandate of

that ministry; for instance air quality, the fact that many, many people are being laid off and there are gaps there.

The amalgamation that's going on within Metro right now, the closing of hospitals, the very, very drastic changes that are being made, the government says, is all being done to deal with the deficit, when we and many, many people are aware that a lot of this cutting and chopping and slicing and dicing and taking a meat cleaver instead of a scalpel, as I heard somebody, I believe in your caucus, say — as I lay on my sick bed at home yesterday, Mr Speaker, I couldn't resist but to turn on the TV and watch the goings and comings of this place, and I listened carefully.

Laughter.

Ms Churley: It's true. I'm sure that every other member in this House does the same thing: Sick as you may be, you can't resist shuffling over to the couch and turning on the TV. I expect I watched more debate at home yesterday than I do when I'm here in this place, because of course we're all really busy doing other things. I must confess I watched from question period pretty much right up to the end of 6 o'clock with little naps in between in some of the more boring speeches. I won't say who they were. But I did pay careful attention and I liked that expression. I forget who said it. It might have been the Speaker himself, in fact, the member from Ottawa-Carleton, I believe.

At any rate, it is extremely important that a neutral body, somebody who is put in that position to pay attention to what governments of all stripes are doing with taxpayers' money, that that person be given more opportunities to report independently to the House so we can look at what's really going on, what's happening with taxpayers' money in these times. Of course, many of us see very clearly what's going on here. This government is having to do this kind of chopping and cutting not for the reason they say, and that is to deal with the deficit, but to contribute to their 30% tax cut, which we all know mainly benefits the wealthy.

We know that is what's going on here, and when we see in reports that the finance minister, who hasn't been in this House now for a bit, but I'm sure when he comes back we'll question him on this — I'm sorry. I know I'm not supposed to comment on that, and I withdraw that if necessary. But I would say that we have a lot of questions to ask the finance minister about his spending of taxpayers' money on lavish dinners in expensive restaurants and the fact that, according to a report in the newspapers, that minister was not forthcoming when asked by the press and indicated that he spent less money than our previous finance minister, Mr Laughren. As it turns out, that appears to be not quite correct. There have been receipts that don't quite tell —

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: Member for Nepean, you're not in your seat.

Ms Churley: Things crossed out, blacked out. We don't know what that minister has been doing, but I can tell you, at a time when this government is trying to chop in every area, in every department, is chopping like crazy and really hurting people — we see it in the family support plan; we see it in rape crisis centres; we see it in

hospitals; we see it in the environment; we see it in labour; we see it right across the spectrum, what this government is doing, and we know that it's to finance this tax cut. They're borrowing money to finance this tax cut. We know that, and at the same time we read reports that the finance minister is out spending money like crazy.

I believe this government, when they ran on the Common Sense Revolution, talked about the need for — you know, they've gotten rid of some ministers and they've talked about the need to spend taxpayers' money more wisely. I'm shocked to find out that the finance minister is not doing that. It's setting a very bad example for all politicians at this time.

1020

I believe it's important that we support this bill today, that we give the auditor every opportunity to report to this House and to the people of Ontario what is really going on with their money, and I expect that all of the members today would support this bill for that reason. I can't see any reason whatsoever why government members would not want to give the auditor an opportunity to report more frequently, give the taxpayers more information about what is going on with their money. I urge all members to support this bill today.

Ms Isabel Bassett (St Andrew-St Patrick): It's my pleasure today to respond to the private member's bill of my colleague from Ottawa East, Bill 74, An Act to amend the Audit Act.

At present, Ontario's Provincial Auditor issues only one annual report on government spending, and there is also a process for the auditor to report quickly to the Legislature on important and urgent matters. Under Bill 74, the auditor would also be able to issue reports up to three times a year in addition to any special reports.

We support this bill because it would give the auditor more latitude to report on a timely basis, and this would help ensure that public money is used efficiently and for its intended purpose. It would increase the government's accountability to taxpayers. Ontario taxpayers want to know and are entitled to know that they're getting good value for their hard-earned dollars. When they are not getting value for money, we want to take action. This government was elected on a mandate to increase accountability, control spending, and eliminate waste. We want taxpayers to know exactly what we are spending on and why. We want them to know that we understand that when government spends tax dollars, it is taxpayers' money, not government money. And we have delivered.

We scrapped the MPPs' gold-plated pension plan, we got rid of tax-free allowances to politicians, and we have cut our own pay by 5%. We are reducing the number of politicians in Ontario by 20% and we have introduced a sunshine law that discloses the salaries of all public servants earning \$100,000 a year or more. Each ministry has also developed a business plan to explore the most cost-effective ways to carry out their role. As in the private sector, these plans set performance standards, and this enables the government and the public to judge just how effectively ministries are doing their jobs. We're also reducing administration costs by 33%.

We have promised to fix a broken welfare system, and we are doing that. Programs are focused on taking care of people in need of permanent help and giving a hand up to people who need temporary assistance. Today there are fewer people on welfare since we took office, and most left the welfare system for the workforce.

Our Who Does What initiative will reduce the cost of sorting out, once and for all, the rules and responsibilities of the many overlapping, duplicated layers of government. Our government is clearly about better services to the public at the least cost. It's about finding the best way to deliver services so that we and other levels of government can save taxpayers' money.

We are eliminating job-killing red tape, unneeded and outdated rules that discourage investment and job creation. We will reduce regulatory costs on business and reduce government costs of enforcing unneeded rules. We have taken a wide range of actions to eliminate waste and increase accountability, and we are not finished yet. Our government is staying the course. It is absolutely committed to reducing the cost of government so that we can balance the budget, create jobs and create more growth. In addition, we want to restore hope and opportunity for this generation and for generations to come.

Bill 74's objective, to allow the auditor to report more frequently, would help us to achieve this goal. We want the auditor's input on ways to save the taxpayers' money. This can only benefit Ontarians in lower taxes, better services and smaller and more efficient government.

I want to thank the member for Ottawa East for his efforts, and I want to offer my support as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance for this bill's desire to improve accountability and prompt reporting. I recommend that the bill be referred to the public accounts committee for review between its second and third readings, and I also recommend that we request the Provincial Auditor's opinion as part of the public accounts review.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I'm pleased to rise in support of the bill presented by my colleague the member for Ottawa East. Clearly, as he has said, this bill is permissive. It is not a requirement that the auditor present a given number of audits during the course of the year, but it leaves that decision to the judgement of the auditor as to what he believes is necessary in the public interest.

As my colleague has said, this is a bill which will be welcomed by the auditor, and it will provide the auditor with an opportunity to examine the many changes and the many new partnerships which this government is undertaking.

This bill is a necessary check and balance on the government, provides the opportunity for the auditor to provide that check and balance, and this is absolutely essential when we have a government that is determined to make so many changes that it's not prepared to take the time to get things right.

There is no question in my mind that we need more scope for value-for-money audits to be done by our auditor so that we can have a knowledgeable and an objective examination of the impact of the government's actions, not on people, which is beyond the auditor's

scope, but at least the financial impact of the changes this government is bringing to bear.

We have already seen, in some instances, in the government's haste to make its changes, to bring about its so-called restructuring, which is really nothing more than a slash-and-burn downsizing, the economic folly of some of these changes.

I give you one example: In the last round of cuts, the government advertised the fact that it was going to stop one of these terribly excessive expenditures of government of sending OPP cars to Thunder Bay to be retrofitted and to be repaired. The fact is that was not what was happening. The government didn't understand itself what was going on. They shut down the OPP garage in Thunder Bay so that the OPP cars that are used in northwestern Ontario could not be fitted out in northwestern Ontario. Those same cars have to be fitted out now in Orillia, put on a flatbed train or truck and shipped up to Thunder Bay. The net annual increase in cost to the government of that supposedly efficient move will be \$20,000. It's not a lot, but it exemplifies the kind of banner advertising the government wants to do, saying how great these moves are, how they're going to save the taxpayers' money, when in fact in this instance — and it was one of the ones the government chose to highlight in its ads — it not only was not going to save the government money, it didn't reflect what was actually happening and it's going to end up costing the government money on an annual basis.

We've also seen the public dangers that are inherent in what the government is now doing. The auditor has commented on some of these areas before, and I just want to again use one example from last year's auditor's report, in which he expressed particular concern about the need to monitor groundwater quality. The auditor took time to go over a number of incidences in which there were major concerns affecting public health because of the lack of what he felt were adequate standards and adequate monitoring of groundwater quality.

The auditor's recommendation was that "The ministry should monitor groundwater quality on a systematic basis to provide assurance of its safety for the environment and human health as well as to enable the ministry to take prompt remedial action when necessary."

What has the government done in response to that specific and important recommendation of our auditor?

1030

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Nothing.

Mrs McLeod: They did actually do something, I say to the member for St Catharines. Unfortunately, it was all regressive, because the first thing they did was to shut down all the regional testing labs of the Ministry of Environment. Those are exactly the same labs that were testing all the water quality for the municipalities.

There was nothing to take the place of those regional labs in the private sector at that point, and as the private sector labs have scrambled to at least be able to do some of the basic water testing, we have found — surprise — that the cost of those private sector tests is going to be as much as double to three times and, in two cases, five times as much as what the government was paying to do the same testing.

And what have we lost as well? It's not only not cost-efficient, but what have we lost? We've lost exactly what the auditor said was important, which was that the government itself had the capacity to monitor and enforce its own standards.

The government decided maybe it couldn't meet that recommendation, maybe the cutbacks alone were not going to be sufficient to get it out of the need to respond to the auditor's recommendation, so now it has decided that it will simply abandon water and sewage to the municipality. Then they can wash their hands of the whole responsibility, with no concern for cost-effectiveness, because that hasn't been examined in the megadumping that we're looking at, but certainly without any concern as well for the impact on individuals.

I will stop at this point simply by saying that I hope the auditor is able to take a proactive role in looking at some of the plans the government has for change, like the amalgamation of school boards, so that they can look at the concern raised by other auditors that this could cost more, not less, and have that examined before it's too late.

I'm glad the government will support this. It wants to talk about cost-effectiveness. It needs to have this objective examination. I will look with interest to see whether it ever actually becomes law.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener): I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill 74, An Act to amend the Audit Act. When I first saw the bill, I was wondering why it was being introduced. I have to admit that I was a little cynical. I wondered what the member for Ottawa East was trying to accomplish — I see him laughing there — but I realized that he wasn't trying to embarrass our government, because I figured he's a gentleman. I respect him as a gentleman.

Then of course I looked at it and I said to myself, why not? Why not have this bill? It is common practice in business to have an internal audit. It's common practice to have it performed as often as necessary: processing methods, safety, environment, profit and loss etc.

The CEO and the board of directors welcome these audits as a method to improve their company and aid in their accountability to their shareholders. Likewise, in government, we should welcome these audits. Our shareholders, the taxpayers of the province, want a streamlined government. If the auditor deems it necessary to present more than one audit per year to achieve this end, then this bill provides him with the necessary authority to do so.

It improves government's accountability to the taxpayer. Experience shows us that such audits would have been beneficial to the previous government. With the benefit of the Provincial Auditor's experience and insight — who knows? — that government might not have continued the lavish spending of drunken sailors begun by the Liberal government under David Peterson.

When I meet with my constituents, all are concerned about where their tax money is going. They want more than an annual report. Once a year isn't good enough for them. They like the accountability that we have restored to the provincial government, but passage of this bill

would give them the added assurance that we are spending their money wisely.

This is what too many governments have never fully understood: Tax money is not ours. Tax money is not the government's money. Tax money is the taxpayers' money. We in government, we in this chamber, are merely the taxpayers' trustees. We are entrusted with the responsibility of spending only the amount needed to provide the services that they can't provide themselves. They don't want and they don't need to be looked after from the cradle to the grave. They only want essential services.

Our government promised the taxpayers that we would control spending. All right, let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers that we would eliminate waste. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers that we would streamline government and reduce bureaucratic red tape. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers that we would cut personal income tax, that this action would help in the creation of jobs and contribute to an increase in overall tax revenues to the government. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised to eliminate duplication by the many layers of government. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers more for less, better services, less government interference and less cost. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers not to reduce spending on health care but to allocate the funding to better prepare for our future needs. Let the auditor report on our progress. We promised the taxpayers that we would balance the budget by the end of our first term. Let the auditor report on our progress.

Bill 74 will amend the Audit Act to allow the Provincial Auditor to present up to three reports per year in addition to his annual report. This should be viewed as a positive step. It will allow, even encourage, government to respond or react quickly to recommendations. This can only benefit the taxpayers of the province.

I was very interested in the member for Fort William's comments on advertising. I wonder how she justifies the \$22-million advertising budget of the last year of the David Peterson government, the Liberal government. That was purely political. Our advertising budget will be one third of that \$22 million.

I view this bill as an aid to increasing government accountability to the taxpayers. I applaud the member for Ottawa East for his efforts in this regard. I will be supporting the bill and I encourage all members to support it.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): I cannot let the last comment of the last speaker go by without saying that when you talk about advertising, certainly the people of Ontario are under the impression that a lot of the advertising dollars being spent right now, with the Premier sitting either in a hockey rink or elsewhere, is just totally wasted money, particularly when hospitals are being closed throughout the province and when there's been so much cutting already in the social services in this province. The money would be much better spent, rather than on advertising, on the actual programs themselves.

I'm sure there are some people who are watching out there and saying, "Isn't the auditor in effect a government employee?" I think that people should clearly understand that the auditor reports to the Legislative Assembly and does not report to the government as such. The report that is presented annually is a rather thick report, and if we look at the code of conduct or the purpose of the report, we should all be reminded of what that is exactly. As he states in his report, "Better accounting for the government's revenues, expenditures and financial affairs, plus the better accountability for the government's performance in achieving legislative objectives, equals better value for the taxpayers' money."

It should be clearly understood by the people of Ontario that the auditing that is being done nowadays is not the way it used to be done when it was purely a financial exercise, without any kind of value-for-money kind of auditing that is currently being done, in which the auditor actually makes suggestions as to how programs can be improved, how money is being wasted in particular departments and how the taxpayers' money — and I totally agree it's not the government's money; it is the taxpayers' money — can be better safeguarded.

The Provincial Auditor is also a completely non-partisan individual who does not get involved in the day-to-day politics of this place. I think the taxpayers would benefit from this kind of legislation. The Provincial Auditor is there. Why limit him to one particular report per year? Give that department scope and latitude to look into the various departments the government operates. We all know that government nowadays is really big business. It is very difficult for a competent government — which I'm not saying the current government is by any stretch of the imagination — or a competent minister to have a clear idea as to what exactly all the financial expenditures are within his particular department. Certainly the independent view from the outside, looking into a department in a non-partisan way, I think we can all benefit from.

1040

Of course, one of the programs we are looking forward to the Provincial Auditor taking a look at is the program of the downloading that's currently taking place, because I think the people of Ontario should understand that although \$5.4 billion is being taken off the property tax roll in educational services, \$6.3 billion is being added on to the property tax roll, for a net effect of \$1 billion, an average \$540 increase in property taxes for each and every household in this province. That is a lot of money.

I think we will see that once he takes a look at what happens when some of these downloading exercises are completed — I hope the government will change its mind and do the right thing by taking off the social services, health care services and ambulance services that they're presently dumping on to local municipalities, but if they pass that bill, I would certainly hope the Provincial Auditor will take a look at some of these downloading exercises. I am sure he will come to the same conclusion we came to, and that is that the Mike Harris plan is fundamentally flawed. Our task force came up with this as a result of talking to over 150 citizens and individuals throughout Ontario. His plan is flawed and I am sure the

Provincial Auditor will back us up on that in the years to come.

Mr Gary Fox (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings): I am pleased to speak on Bill 74, An Act to amend the Audit Act. On a personal note, when I decided to run as a Tory candidate in the 1995 provincial election, I was attracted to the platform of the Common Sense Revolution because for me it signified a style of politics. The CSR promised more accountability to the taxpayer and a more open style of politics. I support Bill 74 because it enhances this new political style.

Over the years, changes and amendments to the way in which public reports are delivered to the public are necessary. This is particularly relevant in the Office of the Provincial Auditor, who deals with such important issues as the financial impact of the annual report, significance to the Legislature, public safety and past audit reports.

Changing the way the audit report is released is an example of sound fiscal management. Under the proposed changes, the Provincial Auditor would be able to issue a maximum of three special reports when warranted, instead of waiting until year end, when the annual report is released. I believe this will make it possible for people to gain greater access to the reports issued by the auditor. This will also make the Provincial Auditor more accountable to the taxpayer. This bill allows the auditor to retain the power to submit special reports to the Speaker on any matter of pressing importance or urgency that the auditor feels is too important to be deferred until the presentation of the next session.

Opponents to this change may suggest that the office of the auditor may become buried in paperwork and unable to do the job at hand. They may argue that the size and complexity of the provincial operations make it impossible to issue more reports. However, I cannot see that this is an argument that has merit. In my view, these changes will allow the auditor the flexibility and the autonomy to report to the Legislature when he or she deems it is necessary, and at the same time require the auditor to advise the public where their money is being spent.

To the average citizen, these changes may seem insignificant. But the important issue here today is that in a small way, the proposed changes that Bill 74 introduces fulfil the election promise of paving the way to providing better services at less cost to the taxpayer. I'd like to say that one set of books for any business is enough, and that's whether you're in business for yourself in the private sector or in the government.

I would like to thank the member for Ottawa East for his hard work in preparing this bill, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr Bradley: I will be supporting this bill this morning because I think it makes some good sense and allows more flexibility for the auditor, and indeed we need the auditor looking into a number of matters of concern.

I would like to see the auditor look into government advertising and try to determine, as a totally independent person, whether the nature of the advertising that we see on the air at the present time with the Premier reading a teleprompter in a classroom, or the Premier reading a

teleprompter apparently in a hospital, or the Premier reading a teleprompter, to do with municipal affairs, at a hockey rink or something of that nature — you see, the auditor now must look at value for money, which is different from the Audit Act when it started out. I would like the auditor, as an independent person, just as we have the Speaker as an independent person, to look at government advertising. I'd like the auditor to look at it in terms of value for money. In other words, is this simply political advertising? Is it the worst kind of government propaganda?

If the auditor had more flexibility, he would be able to look at that, the fact that Premier Harris is costing the people of this province millions of dollars with his government advertising. He has a picture of him in a hospital, and of course in the Niagara region we would be very interested in that because we're going to have his picture in front of a lot of hospitals that are closed if he follows through with his plans.

The auditor might even look at the statement that the Premier made and compare it to what's happening, because he can do that, as you know, Mr Speaker. He can look at a statement by the Premier on May 18, 1995, during the leaders' debate in the election campaign. When asked by Robert Fisher of Global TV about his plans for the health care system, he said, "Certainly, Robert, I can guarantee you I have no plans to close hospitals."

While I'm speaking at this time, Mike Harris is closing hospitals in Toronto, and of course those hospitals will have an effect on the rest of the province. There are many people from all of our ridings who come to Metropolitan Toronto to receive the excellent services that have been available. I know the Premier said that it's just like hula hoops, because the Premier lives in the 1950s, in the days of hula hoops, and he says: "Well, the nurses, they're like hula hoop makers. They went out of style and so the company had to change." And so the nurses, I guess, have gone out of style. I guess nobody needs health care any more. That must be what's happening.

I know my friends the member for Ottawa East and the member for Carleton East, who are both here today, are very concerned about the Montfort Hospital, the Riverside Hospital and the Ottawa Grace hospital, all of which are going to be closing in the riding.

The Deputy Speaker: You've got to speak to the bill.

Mr Bradley: This is what I want the auditor to look at when he does this. I want the auditor to be able to look at the closing of hospitals to see if indeed that is value for money, because that's going to be important. People are going to say: There is a government expenditure out there. Is it valuable in Kitchener, for instance; is it going to be valuable to close the hospitals in the Kitchener area, or the London area, or St Catharines, the Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines, the Douglas Memorial Hospital in Fort Erie, the Niagara-on-the-Lake hospital, the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital, the Port Colborne hospital, taking \$44 million out of hospital funding in the Niagara region?

He could look at that through this, and that's why I like the flexibility. That's why this is timely, to have the auditor look at these matters and look at whether the

money that the Premier is spending on self-serving government propaganda, over \$750,000 for education ads and now for health care ads, would be better spent in the classrooms in the case of education and in maintaining our hospital services in the province. I would suggest that that is probably the case, and that's why the member has a very timely resolution, because under his provision they can now look at it throughout the year. The government can move more quickly when the auditor identifies these problems.

I know the auditor is going to look at the problem of hospital closings right across this province, because he's going to look at them remembering that Premier Harris did make that famous statement: "Certainly, Robert, I can guarantee you I have no plans to close hospitals."

So I think this is a timely resolution today. I think the people who are worried about the only French-language hospital, for instance, in all of Ontario closing, the Montfort Hospital, perhaps they'll go to the Provincial Auditor now and say, "Is this true value for the money being expended?"

1050

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I have a minute and I'd like to commend the member for Ottawa East on bringing this resolution before this Legislature.

Auditing is an important factor in society today and I just wish there was more auditing done with regard to expenses and what takes place within government. I think in the ministries we have there are many expenditures that are made that do not appear to be accounted for. If this will allow the auditor to go in and investigate further, that is important.

I'm also concerned with regard to the amount of staff the auditor has. I know he has been cut back, as has every ministry. What are we going to do to make sure he has the staff to allow him to do what we're asking him to do?

I commend the member. I hope with the auditor being given some further authority, he will be looking into some of the expenses that go on around this Legislative Building.

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): Mr Speaker, I thought I might ask for unanimous consent. Since there are a few minutes left of time in the House, I believe there is unanimous consent from the other two parties to speak.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there consent? Agreed.

Mr Baird: I just wanted to speak very briefly to this bill and to commend my colleague the member for Ottawa East on bringing forward this important piece of legislation.

Private members' hour is a time when traditionally all parties and all members of this House put aside partisan politics and try to bring forward important issues of public policy to debate in this place. I do commend the member for Ottawa East for bringing forward a piece of legislation of this scope. I think it speaks volumes on his integrity and character that it is receiving what appears to be unanimous agreement from all parties in this House.

I think the Audit Act is a very important piece of legislation. The role of the Provincial Auditor has been very important over the last 25 years in Ontario. As the size and scope of government have grown, the auditor

has been a key player, working directly for this assembly and not for the government; working for every member of this House and for the people of Ontario to ensure that every tax dollar the hardworking taxpayers of the province submit to the government is spent wisely and well.

The scope of that act and the function of audit have expanded dramatically as the size of government has grown over the last 25 to 50 years. The ability of the auditor to report simply once a year probably is hampered by that issue. The fact that the member for Ottawa East is proposing that he be allowed to do so more often I think would be a very beneficial aspect to the taxpayers, because the taxpayers expect every dollar they send to Queen's Park to be spent wisely and well. They want accountability. They want a more accountable process.

Some of the innovations we've seen with respect to the Audit Act and the Provincial Auditor in recent years, ensuring that there's one set of books kept — the Provincial Auditor spoke very strongly about that issue. To the credit of the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Ernie Eves, he accepted most of the Provincial Auditor's recommendations going back a good number of years and has implemented those changes into the accounting practices of the province of Ontario. The public has a right to expect, when they look at the books of the province, to get an accurate portrayal of the finances of Ontario, and that's very important.

Value-for-money audits are something that's very important. What we've seen at the federal level, with the federal Auditor General and the last three Auditors General in the federal government, is an expanded mandate to look into value for money. They can look into programs and say, "Are the taxpayers getting value for money?" They've found some horror stories over the last number of years from governments of all three political parties. What they've been able to do is hold the government accountable for the way those decisions are made, and I think that's very important.

Taxpayers work very hard for their money. People in my constituency of Nepean want their elected representatives to be able to look them in the eye and say that every single tax dollar we're spending we're spending wisely and well. That's something that's very important for people in Nepean.

We in Ontario are very well served by our current Provincial Auditor, Erik Peters, who is probably one of the best friends the taxpayers have had in the province over the last five years. We're very fortunate to have someone of his skill.

Mr Gerretsen: You only got half the time.

Mr Baird: I know the member for Kingston and The Islands is a big fan of the Provincial Auditor. The Provincial Auditor has done an exemplary job in very difficult circumstances in recent years and we should all congratulate him for those efforts.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate? The member for Ottawa East, two minutes.

Mr Grandmaître: I can't respond to every member, but I would like to thank them for their support. I would like to respond specifically to the member for Simcoe East, who talked about staff. I can assure the member for Simcoe East and the members of this House that this was

brought up when I spoke to the auditor, and I was advised that no additional staff will be needed. He does have the proper staff in place to provide these special reports whenever they're needed.

Also, as the member for St Catharines pointed out, this is value for money. We've said a number of times this morning that the auditor's view is an independent view. I see deputy ministers and ADMs before the standing committee on public accounts trying to — not fight with the Provincial Auditor but at the same time trying to sell their programs. So I'm glad the auditor is pleased with this amendment and he will bring about changes and provide us with more opportunities to discuss and debate those programs, those great changes.

Again, I'd like to thank all the members who participated this morning. Hopefully every one of them will support this.

I still have two minutes, Mr Speaker. Is there an extra two minutes or one?

Interjection: You can't hold your own time over.

Mr Grandmaitre: So I only have one second and that's it? Thank you very much for supporting my bill.

The Deputy Speaker: The time allotted for ballot item number 69 has expired.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO FOUNDATION ACT, 1997

LOI DE 1997 SUR LA FONDATION DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Leadston moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 123, An Act to establish the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Foundation / Projet de loi 123, Loi créant la Fondation de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Pursuant to standing order 96(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Gary L. Leadston (Kitchener-Wilmot): I rise this morning to speak regarding the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Foundation and hope for your support for the establishment of such a foundation.

Each year more than 250,000 individuals, Canadians, foreign visitors and heads of state, visit Queen's Park. Its rooms serve as the legislative chamber, committee rooms, the residence of the Lieutenant Governor, a reception centre for dignitaries and a museum of Ontario art and antiquities.

As you know, the Management Board appropriates funds for the annual operation and maintenance of the Legislative Assembly and the Whitney Block. Refurbishing projects and acquisitions, however, have always been financed from public funds. I believe it is time to attract corporations and individuals to assist financially with the ongoing restoration projects within the legislative buildings. For that reason, I'm introducing the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Foundation Act.

The objects of the foundation are to solicit, receive and manage money for the purposes of maintaining and restoring the historic legislative buildings in Queen's Park. This act will establish a board of directors of 12 to

manage this foundation. There will be one member from each recognized party in the assembly and the remainder will be appointed by order in council by the Lieutenant Governor. The board members should be composed of prominent citizens who have a strong interest in historical restoration. Members of the board will not receive any remuneration, with the exception of reasonable expenses.

1100

On April 4, 1893, these Parliament Buildings were officially opened. The Legislative Building introduced a new style of architecture to Toronto, the Romanesque revival, which became one of the most important influences in both public and private design throughout the province. Over 100 years later, these Parliament Buildings still represent an expression of the symbolic and monumental aspirations of their era and are the tangible symbol of the seat of government for Ontario and our democratic heritage.

It is essential to understand and appreciate Ontario's history and common purpose. As such it is worthy of the highest standards of care and conservation, and we are not conserving the buildings as well as we should be.

These grand old buildings are showing their age. In June 1991 a report was presented to Speaker Warner from the special committee on the parliamentary precinct. This report stated that the original richness of the Parliament Building's design and crafting has been obscured by time and a long history of necessary but often haphazard and very insensitive changes.

These insensitive changes can be seen throughout the building, from the visible electric wiring to the white-washing of the magnificent frescoes on the roof of this Legislative Assembly. In my office, contractors had used their hammer to break a hole in the plaster walls just to run wires through them. The original architect and the craftsmen who built these buildings would absolutely shudder to see what has happened to their work of art.

Unfortunately, the necessary budget cuts have slowed down or halted the projects identified in the parliamentary precinct report. We need to find, yes, we must find alternate ways of funding these buildings, and I believe that this bill is the only real choice.

The New Jersey, New York and Texas legislatures all have less government funding than before and now are successfully obtaining private funds to repair and restore their public buildings. The White House has also had a private endowment fund since 1990 and is currently raising over \$20 million a year for restoration in that facility.

The bill I am proposing is very similar to the endowment funds in my aforementioned statement. I am not proposing that we overcommercialize the Legislative Buildings. There will be no Ontario Hydro wing or Casino Rama library. There should be a tasteful plaque to recognize the major contributions to this foundation.

Both the Management Board and the Board of Internal Economy will determine the financial needs for renovation projects at the Legislative Building and the Whitney Block. This financial information would be given to the foundation so that they would be able to set their own fund-raising goals for the following year. It should be noted that all donations to this foundation will be tax-

deductible, with no limit on how much they can give. In fact the tax deduction will average around 50% of the amount deducted.

We must find ways of funding historic buildings. I believe that this bill will help in guaranteeing the future of Queen's Park and the Whitney Block. These old buildings of Queen's Park have to last longer than 100 years or even 200 years. They should last forever. To ensure that future generations will enjoy the majestic splendour of their architecture and their symbol of democracy, I would urge all members of the House to support this bill to bring restoration of this beautiful building back to its original glory.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): Coming from a community which has more designated buildings than I believe were at one time designated throughout Ontario — I'm speaking of the city of Kingston — I know how important historic preservation is. I come from a community that for a very short period of time, back in the 1840s, was the capital of Canada. It was during that period of time that many of the limestone buildings, both public and private, that we have in our community were first built. When the Ontario Heritage Act was proclaimed, and that was proclaimed in Kingston in our historic city hall, it set a landmark for historic preservation and is something I totally believe in.

I will be supporting this bill, and I know there are some people in my own caucus and perhaps some people in the NDP caucus who will not be supporting it. I have some major concerns. I am concerned when the member raises the examples of American experiences. I'm concerned about privatization. Are we going to have a McDonald's library? We've seen it with lots of events that are taking place throughout the province now. They've all got an advertising tag attached to them, and I certainly wouldn't want that to happen here. There have to be very strict guidelines imposed on the foundation.

However, I totally understand that some people out there may be willing to donate to the historic preservation of this building who wouldn't just give money to the government of Ontario to put into the general pot, as it were, and then be spent on the renovation of this building. People and organizations may be much more inclined to contribute in situations where the money is actually going to a specific purpose, such as the renovation of this building. It's with that in mind that I support the bill; I realize that's a reality, that we may be able to get money into this foundation that people wouldn't donate otherwise. It's on that basis that I'm supporting it.

I have concerns about some of the individual clauses in the bill. If it is going to be a true foundation, then for example the representation which is suggested as coming from the three parties, or from however many parties there may be in the Legislature at any one time, ought to be equal representation; the representation should not be stacked in favour of the governing party. If the money truly comes into the foundation as contributions from the people of Ontario, then there should be equal say by all parties as to how that foundation money is actually to be spent in this Legislature. The bill is silent on that. It talks about it in generalities, and that's certainly something we have to take a look at.

All you have to do is just look at the small portion of the ceiling here that has been uncovered and see the paintings or the frescos — I'm not sure what that is, maybe even wallpaper — to see the significance of what this hall must have looked like at one time when the entire room had those floral kinds of designs and those figures looking down on us from the ceilings and from the walls. I suppose a lot of the walls were made into the white or yellow colour to help the television lights. I'm sure that with today's technology we could bring the historic aspects of this room back and still be able to accommodate television lights. I think that ought to be supported.

It's the privatization aspect, the Americanization aspect that I as a person certainly worry about, but I think we ought to give people a choice of whether or not they want to contribute to this particular building. Over the years when I was not in this Legislature, I can remember reading from time to time reports on how much money was actually spent on this building over the last 10 or 15 years. As a layperson I must admit I was shocked that it would cost that much money to maintain it.

Perhaps if it's a foundation, with not only representation from the political parties here but also representation on the board of directors from people on the outside, that will change. Maybe a more businesslike approach will be used in making sure that in the restoration of this building we are really getting value for money. It gets back to the motion we dealt with earlier, as far as the auditor's report is concerned.

There are a number of other aspects of the bill that I have some concerns about. There ought to be very strict guidelines that there will not be any advertising at all, even in name recognition or otherwise. This, after all, is the seat of democracy in Ontario, for Ontario. It is the place that people should always be able to look at and be part of without feeling part of a commercialization aspect.

I would like to congratulate the member for bringing this forward. I know there are many concerns people may have and I can well understand that some people would take the attitude, why should we need to put up a foundation? Why should we have a foundation? Why should the government not pay for the renovations itself?

My main concern again is that I think there are people out there who will contribute to a particular cost such as the restoration of this building who otherwise wouldn't do so, so I will be supporting this bill when it comes for a vote later on.

1110

Mr Len Wood (Cochrane North): I'm going to be very brief. I'm a little bit concerned if we're going to turn this building and the other building they're talking about, the Whitney Block, into the American style where private companies and individuals feel they have more involvement in the restoration and maintaining of a building than what the taxpayers have been doing over the last 100 years. I believe all three governments, over the last number of years, have done an excellent job of repairing this particular building, the Legislative Assembly, and the buildings around it.

Over the last 10 years there have been large amounts of taxpayers' money put into restoring the stone on the

outside and doing repairs that were needed around the outside of the building to make sure the building will be here for hundreds of years for the thousands of visitors who visit this place, not only from Ontario but right across Canada and from around the world. Every day I'm in the Legislature I see visitors in both galleries, and also the visitors we get from other governments.

I would be opposed to seeing private companies or individuals bringing in dollars to this, to see it privatized like we see happening in some of the American states. The intention might be good, because we're all concerned that we don't want to see the present building and the Whitney Block deteriorate, but I know, as I said before, that all three parties that have been in government over the last 10 to 15 years have been concerned with that and have set aside budgets and all-party committees working with the Speaker to make sure the building is restored.

There's still some work that should be done on the upper floors of the Whitney Block and the upper floors of this particular building as far as the inside is concerned, but it was nice to see that a new roof was put on and that the copper that had been deteriorating was replaced. As far as the outside is concerned, the building is protected against the elements of weather for the next large number of years. I'm sure the taxpayers across this province would be quite willing to continue to see the government spend that money on an annual basis to make sure that it does exist.

We know there are concerns as far as some of the government members are concerned, that they'd like to see cutbacks and privatization and restructuring and less money spent right across the province, and privatization is the way they feel things should go.

We just heard major announcements on 13 hospitals that are going to be shut down in the Toronto area. They're saying it's an effort to save money, but thousands of people are going to be thrown out of work as a result of this announcement that was made just in the last 10 minutes. We don't know where all those people are going to be working in the future and what the state of health care in the Toronto and greater Toronto area is going to be. It's a concern not only with the restructuring of all the school boards, with the municipal restructuring, and now with the hospital downsizing and closing of hospitals; it's a concern right across this province.

But one of the things I'm sure we can convince all three parties in this Legislature to do is to spend a few dollars to maintain this particular building and the Whitney Block across the street under the supervision of the Speaker and deputy Speakers of this House. It can be done in an efficient manner without having to revert to privatizing and getting private donations to do the repairs. With that, I'll listen to the comments from other speakers who want to participate in the debate.

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I consider it a privilege to have the opportunity to stand here this morning and to speak with regard to private member's Bill 123, put forward by my colleague Gary Leadston, the member for Kitchener-Wilmot. From these desks in the Legislative Assembly, members such as ourselves have moulded the shape of this great province of Ontario. The history of this province and its parliamentary process

surrounds us in the hallways and the offices in this building.

For over 100 years the people of Ontario, along with visitors and dignitaries, have walked through the hand-made front doors of this magnificent sandstone building. They have come to this historic Victorian building to celebrate, to demonstrate, to parade, to admire, and to rest.

This solidly built, stately building is a landmark in Toronto, the capital city of Ontario. It is home to the Lieutenant Governor and it is a place where decisions are made affecting the lives of all Ontarians. The walls of this building display portraits of parliamentarians, landscapes and early Canadian works of art, along with historic photographs. Some of this country's finest carvings and sculptures of the 19th century decorate the building's interior and exterior.

I consider it a privilege to work in this beautiful building and have admired its significant history every day of the 16 years I have served as a member of this Legislature. The preservation of this building is very important to us as members and to the people of Ontario whose lives are affected by the decisions made in this chamber.

At present we know there has been a study completed on the history of the building and a restoration plan has been drawn up and approved by the Board of Internal Economy. Much work has been done in completion and restructuring of the north wing. Some work has been completed, such as the roof replacement, and the cleaning and restoring of the sandstone blocks and carvings on the exterior. This work has cost the people of Ontario millions of dollars, money which needed to be spent since the work was done to preserve the structure. However, like any historic building, much more work is needed on the interior to restore the building to its original splendour.

Over the years, different governments have had different needs for the interior space, and unfortunately in many areas the original architecture was altered and in some cases destroyed accommodating these needs. I feel there must be a control mechanism in place to prevent any further damage to this structure and I recognize the cost involved in maintaining this building, especially if we are preserving its historic value at the same time.

In these times of government spending restraint, I feel Bill 123 provides the tools for the funding, preserving and restoring of this building.

Under the current system, employees of the Legislative Assembly control the restoration and maintenance of this building with approval from the Board of Internal Economy from a sum of money which has been allotted for that. Then the staff may proceed on their own, and from then on we do not see the approvals as step by step the restoration takes place.

This system allows taxpayers to foot the bill with few questions asked. The downside of the current system is it does not give the taxpayer the opportunity for input or control. The board of directors of the foundation outlined in Bill 123 is composed of 12 members and includes an elected member representing each of the political parties.

The Lieutenant Governor in council shall appoint the remaining members of the board.

I feel this is a more open and controlled system. It clearly represents the people of this province, the Legislative Assembly here at Queen's Park that belongs to the people of the province. Bill 123 allows the people of Ontario to voluntarily support the preservation of their parliamentary building, and Bill 123 allows the people of Ontario to protect the integrity of their parliamentary building. Bill 123 allows the people of Ontario to protect their history and the building where their history and future is protected.

1120

I gladly support Bill 123. The essence is: "The objects of the foundation are to solicit, receive and manage money" and other property "for the purposes of maintaining" in good repair "and restoring the Legislative Building." and the building that is situated directly to the east of the Legislative Building known as the Whitney Block.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I'm pleased to speak on this bill today. I wish to express some concerns about it because I believe that preserving our heritage is a responsibility of government.

I don't know if many people are aware, given all the downloading that's happening right throughout the government, of the concerns that various heritage groups across the province have around the restructuring of the whole heritage part of the government. The government is downloading a lot of the responsibility for heritage preservation to small, volunteer groups who for many years in our communities across Ontario have been out there, have been the ones who have been preserving, making sure that documentation is available. All of that stuff is now being downloaded.

Let me read you something I received from — I have to look and see exactly what this organization is called, but it's one of the heritage organizations in Ontario. What they're concerned about is this:

"Many of Ontario's local heritage groups and/or institutions will soon face an impossible decision: to refuse or accept the original paper land registry office records dating to the period 1868 to 1955, essential to their work concerning the preservation of Ontario's past. If they accept, these groups and institutions may be subjected to an avalanche of land registry office records they clearly cannot handle. If these groups do not take these materials, a truly significant portion of Ontario's documentary heritage will be irretrievably lost.

"In short, this is a snow job on local heritage groups and institutions by this government and its agency, the Archives of Ontario, determined to download yet another one of its fundamental responsibilities on to local groups and institutions, a great many of which are helped by dedicated volunteers and who are also, needless to say, taxpayers."

They go on to say:

"The retention of these documents and registry and copy books has always been a provincial responsibility, paid for by generations of taxpayers.

"Local heritage groups are usually made up of volunteers concerned with...history, genealogy and the preservation of architecture. The only support for these groups

has been the heritage organization development grant program of around \$300,000, for which each group is allowed to apply for to a maximum of \$3,000. Since the spring of 1996 this funding support has been cut back twice by 25% and 26.3% respectively, by the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation.

"Local land registrars are expected to handle the applications. Their instructions are to remove everything (including inventory, registry and copy books) that is pre-1955. Moreover, the institution or heritage group that is selected by the local registrar must accept all the records of a given local registry office.

"In many cases the local registrar is not even aware of what is in their office, or what has been filmed. Often items such as marriage records, wills, ships' mortgages and business partnerships are given registration numbers and filed with LRO records. Clearly the local registrars are too busy taking care of the demands of the present to worry about the past."

They go on to talk about the material, the big volume, and what they're concerned about, I'm sure, is pretty obvious. I'm not surprised that this resolution is before us today, because the government has been quietly, in the midst of everything else that has been going on, downloading responsibilities to small local volunteer groups to continue the preservation of our heritage in this province, and it's shocking.

These volunteer groups work for nothing already, and they're the backbone of the preservation of our history in this province. Now we are in great danger of losing such an important part of who we are, our identity, and that is preserving not only buildings but the records, our very history, because these groups are saying quite clearly that they can't do it without government support, and the government is pulling out those supports and we will lose our ability to preserve our heritage.

It sounds innocuous and it sounds like a good idea. "Just why would anybody vote against it?" you would say. "It's setting up yet again another body to raise funds to help preserve buildings such as this." That's all fine and good, but what it's really trying to do is replace what I believe to be a fundamental, important aspect of what our government does, that is, help to preserve our history.

It's all tied in with this government's removal of any sense of caring about community, present, tearing our communities apart in so many ways. Notwithstanding Bill 103, which I know we're not talking about now, we're talking more about preserving our past. That is going to disappear, and this private member's resolution today gives me an opportunity to talk about it, because most people aren't even aware of it. There's too much else going on.

But there are all kinds of groups out there who have been working very, very hard with small grants from the government, working for free. I know some of these people, and their dedication and their hard work, for free, to help preserve our heritage is going to disappear.

I can tell you that a legislative group getting together to try to raise funds to preserve this building, and maybe a building here and there, is not going to take the place of the badly needed community structures that have been

around for decades in this province, but that because of the actions of this government are going to disappear.

We can't look at this bill in isolation. It occurs to me that it's part and more of the same of this government moving more and more in the direction of the United States. There are states now that have done this, that have pulled out all heritage structures and grants and supports and are relying on the private sector to preserve our heritage. At best it's arbitrary, it's not done in one holistic way, it's not working with local communities. It's having an élite group of people get together to try to determine which buildings warrant being preserved, and it's not the right direction to go.

There are out there already, particularly given the cuts and the downloading from the federal government to the provincial government and now the federal government to the municipalities, all that is going on, more and more charitable organizations trying to raise money for very good causes, in some cases life-and-death situations: shelters for battered women, hungry children, breakfast clubs, you name it; the arts. It's going on out there, and the charitable dollar is getting scarcer all the time.

Now, you tell me in the whole scheme of things, when there is such a demand for the charitable dollar this day, the demand that is getting greater and greater, yes, for health care too, there's no end to it now — I talk to people who are out there trying to raise money for very important causes, and they tell me, and this is no secret to anybody, how hard it is to raise the funds, for two reasons: (1) they have been cut back so much, those who relied on some government funding, that they have to make up even more of that percentage; and (2) because there are so many more charitable institutions out there trying to raise money from the same pockets they're unable to get the amounts of money they need to exist.

1130

I have great doubts about this. I could support this if at the same time this government were committing itself to heritage preservation across the province, instead of which it's gutting the Ontario Heritage Act, the Cemeteries Act, all those acts that support the community groups out there which are trying to preserve our heritage for all of Ontario. That's all being gutted; it's all going to disappear. I'm afraid that a nice little charitable legislative organization is not going to fill that gap. It's wrong-headed, the wrong direction to go, and I would ask that this government go back to the drawing-board and look at what's happening to those heritage groups out there.

The Deputy Speaker: Your time is expired. Further debate?

Mr Bob Wood (London South): On behalf of the Management Board, I'd like to commend the member for Kitchener-Wilmot for bringing forward this idea. It will add to the heritage of every Ontarian and every Canadian. The Management Board would like to suggest an alternate way of proceeding which could get the project started even faster: a special-purpose account under the Financial Administration Act. It would give all of the tax benefits that crown foundations have and would give the opportunity of proceeding even more quickly. This may be worth the consideration of all interested in this proposal. Whatever the method, however, this proposal is

an excellent one, which will give our citizens a direct chance to participate in enhancing our provincial heritage. I hope all members of the House will support it.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): It is my pleasure to rise today to support the member for Kitchener-Wilmot, Mr Leadston. In his private member's Bill 123, Mr Leadston, a well-known and well-respected member of this Legislature, has put forward a reminder to each one of us of the importance of history and its symbols.

Imagine the beautiful Pink Palace we're privileged to work in. It opened over 100 years ago. History and tradition are important to all people. All the people of Ontario cherish history and our symbols and we embrace history itself. After all, if we fail to learn from history, we are doomed to repeat it.

I personally feel a certain pride and privilege in having an office and a place to work in this historic building. I fondly remember my first day sitting in this very Legislature. I imagined the history and the pride in the people of Drew, Frost, Robarts and Davis. Perhaps I'm sitting in one of the very seats they may have occupied.

In my community in the riding of Durham East, Clarington, while serving as a local councillor I was privileged to serve on the LACAC, the local architectural conservation advisory committee, with members like Tom Barrie, Phyllis Dewell, Janie Dodd, Lynn Lovekin, Bill Patterson, Dianna Granfield and many other volunteer board members. They were the custodians of the history in architecture in their community.

Newcastle town hall was built by the Massey family and served as a very important historic monument.

We have a duty and obligation to maintain this provincial palace of democracy.

March 6 also marks a very important day in history for each one of us. First, for me personally, my page, Melissa Semplonius from Knox Christian School in Bowmanville, is serving her last day in this term. Second, Alex McFedries, the senior Clerk of the Legislature, is serving his last day of duty prior to his retirement.

It is a privilege to return to the original intent of Mr Leadston's bill, a bill entitled the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Foundation Act. He's challenging each Ontario citizen to share in the pride and the heritage of this very building. By contributing to or serving in this foundation, they're able to feel a rightful sense of belonging, a sense of purpose and a sense of inclusion.

I conclude by saying that the member has brought forward a very important moment of history and crystallized it in his bill. I am certain that every member of this Legislature will look to the sentiment and support it and leave politics out of this debate.

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): I rise to actually share some agreement and some disagreement with the private member's bill, Bill 123. In some aspects, you can see that we're surrounded by history, this being our provincial capital, the home of our Legislature, and you can see that there is some great need to ensure the preservation of this very historic building.

As some of the speakers have alluded to, this is a place where we bring not only our citizens from across the province but citizens from around the world. We bring them into our provincial capital here and into the Legisla-

ture and we show our visiting dignitaries that we run a fairly good government for the people of Ontario, it being a democratic government; not always a government that will go out and agree with the people of Ontario or a government that is doing the right things, but it is a democracy, and a place like this shows that we are in a home which values that democracy and a place where the work of the province is done.

Again, I agree with the principle behind the private member's bill, but when I take a look at the development of yet another foundation in the province, when I take a look on such a day as today when the city of Toronto is looking at losing a good number of its hospitals, and I think of my own hospital back in Kenora, the one on which I served on the board, and about the establishment of that foundation and when people are asked — and we know, it's like the Premier has said many times, there's only one taxpayer out there, but we also know there are only so many foundation dollars out there as well.

When I take a look at what the foundation for my local health care does and take a look at what foundations here in the city of Toronto will have to do as this government closes down their hospitals, I think of the competition for those particular dollars. When a person is faced with giving the dollar to the foundation which is going to provide very much needed health care in the provincial capital or across the province or giving that money to a foundation that's going to preserve history, I think it's going to be very difficult for them to decide. Again, there being only so many dollars out there, I think we have to take a very close look at that.

That brings me to my next point. We take a look at the system here in Ontario and take a look at what the present government is doing in terms of the Americanization of our system; this is yet another facet of that. I go back to that very, very stringent competition for those dollars that are out there.

As well, when we talk about foundations, especially foundations that will provide money to such a government structure, I worry that when people give to such a foundation they may be expecting something back. We have today a government that leans towards big business, leans towards corporations, leans towards those who seem to be at the upper end of the echelon when it comes to dollars here in the province. It really concerns me that the foundation may be an avenue for people to contribute, thinking that they will actually benefit from some aspect of this government.

When I take a look at the actual bill, Bill 123, as introduced, I take a look at the definitions involved in the act here and it talks about the use of money, section 5: "The foundation shall use money and other property that it receives in accordance with this act for the purpose of carrying out its objects." Again, I understand that we are certainly in need of such dollars, dollars that will contribute, but again it comes at the competition with other foundations. I go back to the hospital foundations where this money is needed as well.

With that, I would just like to say that there are certainly some opposing views in terms of the establishment of this foundation, yet some needs that are considered as being the need of today.

1140

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I think this particular matter before us is worthy of support, and it's for a few reasons that I think so.

First of all, when we look at spending priorities now, I know that the highest priorities when I talk to people would not include changes to this building, yet it is still an important historic building. I don't think that if you were weighing it against — for instance, if you said, "Shall we spend \$44 million on this building or shall we restore \$44 million in hospital funding to the hospitals in the Niagara region?" people would say: "Spend it on the hospitals in the Niagara region. Restore that funding and add \$25 million more, rather than spending it on this building."

That doesn't mean this building doesn't need some work. Structural changes from time to time have to be made for health and safety reasons. In addition to this, this is an important building to the people of this province, so by establishing the foundation, it allows people who are specifically interested in this building and its restoration and its upkeep to make that contribution.

However, as the member for Kenora pointed out as I was listening carefully to him, we have a lot of competition out there for the volunteer dollar. Because the government is withdrawing from so many areas, because the government, for instance, in our area is cutting funding to Bethlehem Place and to a number of other important endeavours, the private sector, as the member would know, and the volunteer sector are now being called upon to do more and more, so there's an increasing competition for those dollars out there. Indeed, those who want to save the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Niagara Escarpment may well, in addition to this, have to put money into that kind of foundation, because the Minister of Environment no longer has jurisdiction over the Niagara Escarpment Commission. He's been removed from that. He's had his legs cut off at the knees, so there may be a need for a foundation in that regard.

The member has observed, however, some of the changes that are taking place to the building. He knows that this is indeed a tourist attraction. The building itself as well as what goes on inside the building is an attraction for tourist visiting, so if there were such a foundation, for instance, there may be many people who would contribute to that.

I'm wondering what's going to happen to the money in hospital foundations. In the Hotel Dieu in St Catharines, where people have made thousands upon thousands and perhaps in the millions of dollars of donations to that specific hospital for those specific services, one wonders what will happen with that money if they close the Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines, which of course this government should not do.

I believed Premier Mike Harris when he said during the election debate — you will recall this, Mr Speaker, yourself — "Certainly, Robert, I can guarantee you I have no plans to close hospitals." On that basis I'm taking the Premier at his word and I think the money should then be safe in the foundation for the Hotel Dieu Hospital.

I think these kinds of foundations have benefit. I'm worried that there's not going to be as much of that money around, because with so many volunteer organizations now having had the financial rug pulled out from underneath them by Mike Harris and the provincial Conservative/Reform party and government, that money is not going to be available to restore this building.

So I want to tell my friend, with the resolution he has, I will be supporting this resolution, and if I feel so inclined some day, I might even make a contribution to the foundation that will be established as a result of this initiative.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Further debate?

Mr Leadston: In summation, I would like to say very simply that the purpose of the bill is very clear. This is not a political bill. If you've taken the opportunity to read it very carefully, it's a very simplified document, similar in wording to other bills with respect to foundations for other purposes. There would be clear representation from all three parties.

I'd also like to say thank you for the very strong support from my colleagues Mr Allan McLean, the member for Simcoe East; Mr John O'Toole, the member for Durham East; and also the comments from the members opposite. I do appreciate their support, even though there was wavering into areas unrelated to the purpose of the foundation.

I believe this bill is essential for the future and the integrity of these statelike buildings. I can appreciate the comments by the honourable member for London South, Mr Wood. However, I strongly feel that this foundation, this bill, needs the backing of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Unlike other class 3 agencies, this foundation will raise funds privately. It will not be spending public funds.

I would like again to thank all the individuals in the House who spoke this morning, who have written me letters, who have spoken to me privately in support of this bill to create the foundation. We will maintain the integrity of this building. As I indicated in my opening remarks, it will not be a commercialization utilizing — various members had mentioned companies that would be using it to display their products. That is not the intent, nor is it the purpose of this bill. The integrity of this Legislative Assembly and these historic buildings will be honoured and will be maintained. I thank all members of the House for your support.

The Acting Speaker: Under standing order 96(f), "When the time allotted for the consideration of private members' public business has expired or 12 noon, whichever is later, the Speaker shall put the question to the House." Is there unanimous consent to proceed with the vote at this time? It is agreed.

AUDIT AMENDMENT ACT, 1996
LOI DE 1996 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LA VÉRIFICATION
DES COMPTES PUBLICS

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): We will deal first with ballot item number 69, second reading of

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Audit Act, in the name of Mr Grandmaître. Is there anyone opposed to taking a vote on this at this time? No?

Is it the wish of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be referred to committee of the whole?

Mr Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa East): Mr Speaker, I had wished for my bill to go to the finance committee, but just to please the government members who will be supporting my bill, I recommend that my bill go to public accounts.

The Acting Speaker: The member has moved that this be referred to the standing committee on public accounts. Is it the wish of the House? It is agreed.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
FOUNDATION ACT, 1997
LOI DE 1997 SUR LA FONDATION
DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): We will now deal with ballot item number 70 standing in the name of Mr Leadston. Is there anyone opposed to taking a vote at this time?

Mr Leadston has moved second reading of Bill 123, An Act to establish the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Foundation. Is it the wish of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour say "aye."

All those opposed say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried.

Shall the bill be referred to the committee of the whole House? It is agreed.

The business of this House being complete, it stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock this afternoon.

The House recessed from 1151 to 1333.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): I rise in the House today to recognize International Women's Day. We have the opportunity today to reflect on the impressive accomplishment of women in our society. Not long ago, women did not dream of taking a full part in all facets of our community. Now we see them in all the trades and professions, in medicine, law, teaching and, yes, even politics.

I'm proud that the honourable member for Fort William, the former leader of the Liberal Party, has been a trailblazer for women in politics, a trend that we hope will continue.

Despite being more than half the population, women have not had the full support of this government, however, a government that is supposed to represent them as well.

I will remind you that \$3.5 million was cut from the women's issues portfolio and another \$1.4 million will be

cut in 1997. Twenty women's centres will be closed next year. The Premier has refused to take responsibility for his welfare cuts creating more hungry kids, blaming the mothers — a classic case of blaming the victim. The Minister of Community and Social Services had the audacity to claim that the debt was the greatest enemy of abused women.

Today is a day to reflect on our accomplishments with pride, but also to remember that there is still a great deal to go and that the road to full integration for women is a journey which is far from complete.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): This government's downloading policies mean nothing short of drastic changes in the way small communities in my riding operate. Marathon, Terrace Bay, Manitouwadge all face huge tax increases because of this government's downloading.

The community of Schreiber, with a population of approximately 1,900 residents, located on the north shore of Lake Superior, faces a potential increase at the property tax level of some 84%. The reason is simple: It has been decreed by this government, without consultation, that Schreiber will now pick up library costs, along with costs associated with health, supplementary costs associated with transportation, seniors, and drug programs for those who are less fortunate. The people of Schreiber will pay, pay and pay again.

What they're asking is: What about consultation? What about a fair tradeoff as opposed to downloading? Forty people are above the age of 80 in the community of Schreiber and you're taking every last penny, every last dime out of their purse, out of their wallet. You should carry the guilt. Shame on you.

NUTRITION MONTH

Mrs Helen Johns (Huron): March is national Nutrition Month, and the theme of this year's campaign is "All Foods Can Fit." The goal of this campaign is to raise awareness that all foods can be part of a healthy diet. They wish to dispel the myth that some foods are good for you and some foods are bad for you. Through information materials, media coverage and local activities across Ontario, Ontarians will be made more aware that healthy eating includes all foods, and this is the key to a healthy lifestyle.

In the May budget, this government allocated \$5 million to children's nutrition. This investment reaffirms the government commitment to nutrition, especially with children. In June, the Premier announced the partnership between the Ontario government, the Canadian Living Foundation and the Grocery Industry Foundation that will be working together in the development of an elementary school children's nutrition program.

This partnership is committed to assisting 400 breakfast programs across Ontario. These programs are estimated to feed 70,000 children. These programs ensure our children eat well and eat healthy food. They also assist children to learn about good nutrition and to lead healthy, productive lives.

The Ministry of Health, through the health promotion branch, is proud to be a partner in this year's Nutrition Month. The health promotion branch promotes nutritional health as well as being there for all Ontarians to help them with nutrition.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I want to talk about what I regard as the height of arrogance. The people of Ontario will be aware that earlier this week in Metropolitan Toronto there was an overwhelming rejection of the government's mega-bill, the bill to amalgamate the cities within Metropolitan Toronto — overwhelming.

What do we find today? Hula Hoop Harris has decided to ram through this bill. Today in committee, the public should be aware, this bill is being rammed through without one single amendment — rammed through. Hula Hoop Harris has said, "We are going to force this bill through on exactly the same timetable as the government always intended." This bill is going to be rammed through on the 1st, 2nd or 3rd of April. Hula Hoop Harris has decided to ram it through.

Furthermore, the government has said, "We will propose some amendments." This is the height of arrogance. We have not seen the amendments. They will be introduced and there will be one hour of debate on the amendments. If any municipality tried to put this over on their public, they would be hauled into court. This is arrogance: ramming the bill through, allowing one hour for any debate on the amendments, ramming it through on exactly the same timetable as before. Hula Hoop Harris cannot get away with this. The public will rise up.

1340

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): Our Premier has taken responsibility for the Niagara Escarpment, a world-famous heritage site, away from the Minister of Environment and tossed it into the lap of the Ministry of Natural Resources, a ministry with a terrible record on the Niagara Escarpment. Talk about having the fox guard the henhouse.

I remind the Premier that the entire reason the then Tory government brought in the Niagara Escarpment plan in the first place was to deal with the public outcry about gravel pits pockmarking the escarpment. It was arrived at after much consultation and compromise. Finally, there was to be some balance between those pushing for resource extraction and the need to protect the escarpment. Gone. Gone because this government seems constitutionally incapable of taking a moderate, thoughtful approach to anything.

The escarpment is the last remaining ribbon of green space across southwestern Ontario. Well, we can't have that, can we? The new minister crows that this is an internal administrative decision. What hogwash.

The Premier knew he had a problem having Norm Sterling presiding over the escarpment's demise because, for those who don't know, he was largely responsible for bringing the escarpment plan in, back in the days when

the Conservatives actually did some conserving. Now that Norm's out of the way, the Premier and his gravel pit buddies are just drooling at the prospect of divvying it up and digging it up. Fire up the backhoes. Let's dig it up and cart it away.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr Derwyn Shea (High Park-Swansea): On March 21 we will be marking the 37th anniversary of the tragic Sharpeville massacre in South Africa, an event that was condemned by peace-loving nations around the entire world.

Three decades ago, the United Nations declared March 21 International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. But despite the progress we have made, the shadow of racism and racial discrimination remains. That's why the principles and goals of equal rights and equal opportunity that March 21 stands for are so very important.

As an Ontarian and as an MPP and as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation in Ontario, I am proud of our government's commitment to build a society that protects human rights, eliminates discrimination and promotes equal opportunity for all its residents.

Discrimination is against the law in Ontario, and this government is committed to helping victims of discrimination. I am proud to report that this year, for the first time in a decade, the Ontario Human Rights Commission expects to close as many cases as it opens. The average length of a caseload has decreased from 22 months in 1992 to 18 months, and further improvements will provide more timely and better-quality service.

On March 21 I encourage my colleagues and their communities to participate in activities commemorating those whose lives were sacrificed in the struggle for racial equality.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton East): I was scheduled to ask the minister responsible for francophone affairs a question today concerning his disturbing statements regarding the Montfort Hospital. But he is not here to answer for the comments he has made, so I will pose the question to all of you. The answer is of interest to all francophones in Ontario and everyone who is interested in the protection of minority rights across this country.

On Tuesday night Mr Villeneuve, the minister responsible for francophone affairs, told a reporter that there was no reason for him to protest against the closing of the Montfort Hospital because it is not in his riding. Then he added that Minister Runciman spoke against the closing of the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital because that hospital was in his riding.

Mr Villeneuve's comments are not to be believed. His comments beg the question: What is the role of the minister responsible for francophone affairs? Is it not to speak for the needs and interests of the francophones of Ontario, the historical minority of this province?

It needs to be understood. The closing of the Montfort is not just about the closing of a hospital, but the beginning of the end of francophone rights in Ontario. Mr Villeneuve's comments are a clear message that we are moving towards complete assimilation of francophones and that we will not hear a word from him about it.

Sauvons Montfort. Sauvons Montfort.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): I was pleased to be joined this morning in my riding of Hamilton Centre by Howard Hampton, my leader, who was there to launch the leaflet that is going across our riding that members of the government had raised and assisted in publicizing because they didn't like it. The reason they don't like it is the fact that it speaks to the damage their downloading is doing to communities like mine in Hamilton and communities across the province.

This leaflet is one of 130,000 we're putting into businesses and households across the community of Hamilton and part of the 1.5 million we're putting out across Ontario. It's very modest, given the fact that this government has access to millions and millions of dollars of advertising that it's using to send out its message that everything is okay.

Well, Mayor Morrow was there today to say it's not okay, and Councillor Dave Wilson and Wayne Marston, president of the labour council, and Gwen Lee, representing seniors, and Andrea Horwath, co-chair of the Hamilton-Wentworth Coalition for Social Justice, were there to say that this is not in the best interests of Hamilton. Dr Marilyn James was in attendance, the regional medical officer of health, to express her concerns about the downloading of public health.

You're going to put \$121 million more on the backs of the property taxpayers and rent payers in Hamilton, and that's unacceptable.

RURAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Toby Barrett (Norfolk): I wish to inform the House that I have met with community hospital boards in and around my riding of Norfolk. A common theme emerged in these discussions of rural health and hospital services, that of accessibility to care.

Tillsonburg District Memorial Hospital, Norfolk General Hospital, West Haldimand General Hospital in Hagersville and Dunnville War Memorial Hospital have stressed the importance of getting people to the hospital from their homes.

Accessibility, one of the three criteria of the Health Services Restructuring Commission, is key to any analysis of the geographic inequities that exist in providing any service to the far-flung communities in my riding or any rural or northern area. For example, issues of distance and weather must be considered by district health councils and the Health Services Restructuring Commission as they make recommendations to improve and modernize health care in rural areas. An urban model does not necessarily apply to rural health care institutions, especially when people need rapid access to emergency services.

and when people, especially seniors, want to convalesce near family and friends.

A rural policy, as stated by the Minister of Health last week, is the type of initiative that people in rural areas of this province did not see from previous governments. It's very gratifying that this minister recognizes these special circumstances.

1350

ALEX MCFEDRIES

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I know the members are for the most part aware, but I want to formally announce to them today that Alex McFedries, Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals, is retiring April 1, 1997, and today is his last day in the House.

Applause.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): I think it might be in order for Alex to give a speech, but I do believe we have unanimous consent that we recognize Alex's contribution.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Do we have consent to speak on the retiring of the clerk? Agreed.

Hon David Johnson: After applause like that, I think it would be most appropriate if Alex, as they do in baseball, stood up and tipped his hat. Certainly you can see, Alex, the sincere and heartfelt view of your contribution and the way people feel about you in this House today.

It was a few years ago that Alex was born in Ayr, Scotland, and came to Ontario in 1957, and at that time, I believe, worked in the Supreme Court of Ontario until about 1961, and started work in this government in 1965, which, Alex, I point out is about five years before the member for Nepean was born, so that was a few years ago.

That is some 31 or 32 years of service here in this House. Through that period of time Alex has outlasted nine Speakers and he's working on his tenth Speaker, but I think Mr Stockwell might outlast you in this particular instance. Actually, Alex has outlasted governments of all political stripes during that period as well.

Of course, he's gone through many highlights during that period of time. I think the abolishing of the midnight sittings was one that's high on Alex's list. Apparently, there was one time during that period where there was actually a leadership candidate — I guess we shouldn't say from which party — who rushed on to the floor and grabbed the mace and declared himself to be a candidate for an upcoming leadership race. Those are the kinds of things that used to happen.

Alex has always been a person who believes in order and decorum and worked diligently for the people of Ontario in that regard. I think he's had a few battles with some of the members over "whereas" clauses, if I can recall, insisting that the proper protocol be followed on all the resolutions and insisting that all the "whereas" clauses be exactly precise.

Alex had the opportunity recently to give some of his experience to the Parliament in Johannesburg, South Africa, as they embark upon a new form of government.

Of course with his 31 years of service in Ontario — 25 of which I might say, as I understand, and this is interesting, were as the Senior Clerk Assistant, which is a record for Canada, not only today, but dating all the way back to Confederation for all the provinces and for the federal government — Alex is that sort of cool, calm, unassuming kind of guy, confident, never gets excited — does he? — but always knowledgeable and always most trustworthy.

You'll note that it's the clerks who sit in the middle, with the politicians on either side, the Speaker at one end, but the clerks are right in the middle of the activity, and Alex is there in the middle of the activity. Well, that's because they think they run the place — and they probably do.

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): They do.

Hon David Johnson: The Premier says they do. In Alex's case, it's because of his knowledge, his experience, the trust that the members have in his ability to give good advice and to contribute to the smooth and efficient running of this Legislature. Alex is the kind of person who will give you advice, not only on whether your approach is in order but procedurally how to go about accomplishing what you want to accomplish. I've appreciated that in Alex. I consider Alex not only to be a person I respect to give good advice but, Alex, I consider you to be a friend as well.

On behalf of the government and on behalf of all the members of the House, I wish you the best, not only to yourself but to your wife, Carolyn, and daughter, Meaghan, who's at university. I know you'll be spending more time on the golf course. You may not know that at one point Alex had a six handicap —

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Six?

Hon David Johnson: Six. I think that's over all 18 holes, as I understand. It may have slipped a little bit in recent years, but Alex tells me it's going to get back to six. He's looking forward to that, to either get his professional card in golf or run the marathon. Isn't that what it is? One or the other. You may find the 18 holes a little bit easier than the 26 miles.

But whatever it is, Alex, all of us wish you the best. We've appreciated your advice and counsel and your presence in this House. We wish the best to you and your wife and daughter in your retirement. All the best.

Mr Gilles E. Morin (Carleton Place): I'd be remiss if I didn't say a few words about my good friend Alex, as I can be the only one in the House who has spent close to 10 years where you are. I remember so vividly in 1985 when Bob Nixon sent me a little note. He said, "You've just been appointed Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole House." I wrote him back and said, "What is that?" He came to my seat somewhere over there and he said, "Gilles, you'll sit in that big chair."

I didn't know if he was serious or not. Of course he was serious. I said, "Look, I don't know the procedures." He said, "Don't worry, you'll learn them quickly." So I took the chair and I recall I was so timid I thought all eyes were looking at me, but after a while I noticed they didn't pay attention to what I was doing. Alex came to me and said: "I know you're concerned. Don't worry, I'm

going to help you. All that table in front of you are there to help you out." And help they did.

I recall not too long ago, Mr Speaker, you had to face a vote where there was a tie. I remember you telling me, "I feel alone." That's exactly what happened. I went through the experience twice. Alex came to me and gave me all the reasons why as to what ruling I should take. I said, "Alex, tell me the one I should use." Alex said, "Speaker, you're on your own," and that was it. It was good advice and I did render the right decision.

Working with him, I thought Alex was extremely discreet, was friendly but distant in a way, of course knew I was in politics. Also, another thing was that whenever I would talk about politics he would listen but never answer, never say anything. I soon found out that he was totally apolitical, a quality which is so necessary for the clerks.

To him the procedures were like a Bible; he stuck to it. He made me think of when I was in the army, that military law was something you simply did not derogate from; you had to abide by it strictly. Of course we had arguments, we tried to defend our point of view, as you went through yourself, Mr Speaker, but Alex was always there to give us at least the help we required to pass a judgement in the chair.

Alex, I want to wish you the best of luck. You're a young man. I know when I first met you you were a bit taller, but I presume that the weight of responsibilities has helped you not to lose your wisdom but perhaps your height. I want you to make sure that I will keep an excellent souvenir, a long souvenir from you. So best of luck, Alex.

Mr Bradley: I too would like to pay tribute, in my capacity as the House leader of the official opposition and as a person who has been in the Legislature almost 20 years, to Alex McFedries, who has provided timely and helpful advice to all of us, regardless of what side of the House we were located on, and has ensured on many occasions the smooth running of the Legislative Assembly.

He's a person who has been occupied greatly with decorum in this House and he has made a valiant effort to advise members on the advisability of having decorum in this House. He has helped us with very tricky and complicated matters related to procedures in the assembly and he has served with distinction the people of this province as well as the people of this assembly in so many ways.

1400

One area where he has been particularly vociferous in recent years has been the area of resolutions. If I may be so bold as to do so, I have a little resolution to read to the House in a short while. One of the attributes someone at the table must have, and Alex certainly has this, is the ability to throw his voice. It is often alleged in parliamentary practice and in the milieu of Parliament, whether it's provincial or federal, that one person is Edgar Bergen and the other is Charlie McCarthy. Since I will characterize Alex McFedries as Edgar Bergen, Mr Speaker, you may draw any conclusion you wish after that.

I would like, on behalf of all members of the assembly, to read a resolution which I plan to introduce the

next time I have an opportunity in private members' hour to do so, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas Alex McFedries has served the Legislative Assembly of Ontario with dedication and distinction at the table since March 8, 1971;

"Whereas Alex McFedries has served under nine Speakers of the Legislative Assembly with sincere commitment to his duties and responsibilities as the Clerk Assistant and the Clerk of Journals and since June 1993 as Senior Clerk Assistant;

"Whereas Alex McFedries has provided timely and helpful advice to members of the Legislative Assembly over the length of his career;

"Whereas Alex McFedries has represented Ontario in an excellent fashion as a member of the Canadian Association of Clerks-at-the-Table and as honorary member of the American Society of Legislative Clerks and Secretaries;

"Whereas Alex McFedries has ensured the production of House documents in an accurate and timely manner as the manager of the Journals branch; and

"Whereas Alex McFedries has worked untiringly, if not entirely successfully, to maintain appropriate decorum in the House;

"Be it resolved that Alex McFedries, after April 1, 1997, be permitted to be released to the custody of his wife, Carolyn, and his daughter, Meaghan; and

"Further, be it resolved that Alex McFedries be permitted to spend as much time as he desires on the golf courses and soccer pitches in Ontario."

I know that I will receive unanimous consent at the appropriate time in private members' hour, a special day to do this, and that you, Mr Speaker, will look favourably upon all the "whereases" contained in this resolution.

To Alex McFedries, we wish him the very best in his retirement. We thank him. We are very appreciative of the service he provides to us. I must say I think all members would agree to the wonderful sense of humour he brings at appropriate times to the House. Thank you, Alex, for your service to this House and to the people of Ontario, and very best wishes to you in your retirement.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I shall certainly commit to supporting that resolution.

I just want to say a few words to Alex, before our whip stands up, on behalf of our whole caucus. Unlike my colleague the Deputy Speaker, I have not been around that long but I too remember what it felt like when my leader came to me and said, "You've just been appointed one of the Deputy Speakers," and I had the same reaction, "Oh God, not one of them" — no offence to you, Speaker — "What do I do?"

I have to tell you it is extremely frightening and intimidating when you first step into that chair with your little uniform on that people laugh a little bit about and tell you from time to time that you look like a cocktail waitress or this or that. It is a frightening experience, and I would like to say that Alex very quickly, along with Debbie and the others, took me aside and gave me some tips. I think the most important tip that Alex gave me — and I still remember it, Alex; you said this to me I believe on my first or second day in the chair — is that you have to know the rules. I have to tell you all that

they gave me photographs of every one of you to take home, and some of them were very funny photographs that got rejected, I believe, for your official documents. Anyway I got to study you all at home, and thank you for doing that.

Alex advised me to use my common sense, sitting in the chair, and I thought that was very good advice in this case, to not be afraid to speak my mind and to react in a natural way to what's going on. I followed that advice. I should tell you as well that Alex — how shall I put this delicately? — always noticed when I came in, and if my collar was turned up or my little tabs askew or anything like that, he would discreetly look up and say, "Speaker, your collar," or he would discreetly reach up and fix it. I don't know if he offers the present Speaker that kind of service. He's nodding yes. That too is very much appreciated.

Interjection: A full-time job.

Ms Churley: It's a full-time job with our present Speaker. He never has to tell me to sit up straight, Speaker.

Alex, I want to say that it has been a real pleasure working with you. I've learned a lot from you. We have had our arguments, not very many, but from time to time. You may not know, but the Speakers and the clerks meet weekly to talk about how the week went and what went right and what went wrong. We didn't always agree, we had some disagreements, but always in a friendly fashion, and we remain friends. I want to thank Alex very much for his support and his help and say how very much and how sincerely I will miss him here. I think my whole caucus shares that sentiment. Thank you very much.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): It is indeed my pleasure to join with my colleagues on all sides of the House in paying a well-earned tribute to Alex today on his last day here with us.

It is hard to imagine that someone could be 32 years with the government and some 25 years here in the Legislative Assembly. He has probably been here longer than the age of the member for Nepean — a lot you have seen, a lot of experience, a lot of stories. I wish the rules of the House — and I know you would be the first one to insist that we follow the rules of the House — would actually allow you to stand and tell some stories, because I think all of us could learn from, be instructed by and quite enjoy some of the tales you would have to tell.

Many people already have said today that they have learned from you. I want the members of this assembly to know that I have learned everything I know about how to facilitate the smooth operation and the dignity and decorum of this place from Alex McFedries.

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): The lunch-hour seminars.

Ms Lankin: I'm not sure what that response was.

Alex, let me say, however, it has not been easy to learn this from you. You have to learn how to put these little clues together. For example, when you go to Alex with a suggestion about the rules of the House and what the response of the Speaker might be if such-and-such took place, you have to look first of all at the set of his mouth. Then there's this glint in the eye. Then you take into consideration which questions he refuses to answer,

and those questions that he does answer, the length of delay it takes before you get the response.

If it's a five-second delay, let me tell you, whatever idea you have or shenanigan you were going to pull, you don't have a hope in Beauchesne's of making it work. If it's a 10-second delay, you know Alex is trying to come up with how he can advise the Speaker to get around whatever it is you're trying to do. If it's a 15-second delay, you've got a gem of an idea, and just go with it quickly before he gets to do any more research on it.

Many people have talked about Alex and his single-minded — I was going to say "obsession" — dedication to decorum in the Legislature. In the time that I have been a member, there has been no individual who has worked harder to maintain the dignity and the decorum in this chamber than Alex McFedries. In his advice to the Chair, in his gentle but firm admonition to individual members of the assembly, he has worked tirelessly, and I think we all agree with this, to make sure this chamber functions the way it should without any outrageous theatrics or ceaseless heckling or circus-like antics that describe so many other parliaments in this country and are so unlike our own chamber. Your success is to be acknowledged.

Alex's single most significant contribution to dignity and decorum of this chamber is, until today, a well-guarded secret, and I am going to share this with you. When Alex sees a threat to the dignity of Parliament, he knows he must do whatever it takes to remove that unruly, disruptive member from active service. That's why he served as campaign manager for our current Speaker.

1410

I want to close by wishing you a very, very happy retirement and hoping that your time with your wife and daughter, which is well deserved, will be enjoyed and that there will be many joyous times for you all.

The hard line you have taken with respect to demonstrations in this Legislature has made it very difficult for us to determine how best to mark your going. Many of us actually really wanted to know why you were leaving. Some people thought that it would be normal for you to see out the end of the term, and we've been told by some people that you thought, with this government, this term may never end, so you decided you had to pick a time.

But I actually have it on very good advice, that of our former Sergeant at Arms, Tom Stelling, who I note is here today in the public gallery, and I say hello to him — you will remember that after Bill 26 and a certain event, Tom just decided that was it and he packed it in — that Tom has advised you that with the mega-week, votes coming up on Bill 103 and Bill 104, you're best to get out now. So we figure that's the reason you're going at this point in time.

However, we want to just pay a final tribute to you to show our appreciation and our respect for all that you have done to maintain decorum in this House, to serve members of all parties, to serve governments of all political stripes.

Speaker, you may want to seek guidance from Alex about the appropriateness of our signs, but we just want to say thank you, Alex.

Interjections.

The Speaker: That's not a precedent, to the Minister of Environment, although it is somewhat unusual.

Mr Bert Johnson (Perth): Mr Speaker —

The Speaker: I'm sorry. The member for Perth.

Mr Bert Johnson: I'd like to take this opportunity, if I could, and I'll not belabour it, but I consider it a privilege to be able to get up and just say a few words, not only to Alex — but especially to you, Alex — but as well to your colleagues at the table. It's a privilege for me to be able to sit in that chair, and I want you to know that I appreciate the help that you give.

I admire a workman who goes about his job and does it well. It doesn't matter that it's a very difficult job or an easy job, you do it well, Alex, and I admire and have a great deal of respect for that.

I think that if I had something humorous to say — and I don't — but if I did, I would mention to you and to everybody in the House that it would be particularly appropriate if we were getting a gift for Alex that it would be a watch. That will go past a whole lot of people except maybe Alex.

I did want to thank Alex. It's been a great deal of pleasure to be able to enjoy you and to admire the way you go about your work. I'm sure it's quite parliamentary — I'm going to do it whether it is or not — but I am going to drink a toast to Alex.

Interjections: To Alex.

The Speaker: Well, Alex, they were all way out of order.

It's probably unusual for a Speaker to enter into this opportunity to speak about a clerk of the table, and I'm sure Alex would have probably advised me not to do it, but what's the point of listening to you now?

I got elected Speaker, and Alex came up to me and he said, "Okay, you're Speaker. You're Speaker." He stood there and he said that for about five minutes, and it finally sunk in that yes, I'm the Speaker. It was interesting, because he came to the office the next day and he started explaining the rules. I listened intently, and I said: "Okay, I know that rule; I tried to break that one. Yes, I know that rule; I tried to break that one."

So then I started asking him some questions. Naturally, as Speaker, I wanted to know where the parameters were, and I learned very quickly that Alex's comments are short, to the point, very direct and consist generally of two letters: N-O. Alex would sit there and I would say, "Well, can a Speaker go about his business and —" "No." "Could a Speaker, say, speak at this —" "No." "Could a Speaker wear his hat backwards?" "No."

Alex knew what the Speaker's job was and what his role was to fill, and that was good, because he'd been here 27 years at that table. When he got here, the Premier was Mr Davis and John Robarts sat where the Minister of Environment is sitting today. He was taking the chair for the first time and he walked in in the parade and on the seat was a phone book. That phone book was put there so he could see above the desk. Today, on his last day, you know the job's taken its toll because there are two phone books on his chair, and he still couldn't see above the desk.

Alex is an interesting guy. The Clerk's office obviously has worked very closely with Alex for a long, long

time and they have great warmth for Alex and the way he went about doing his business. Alex considers himself to be somewhat of a poker aficionado. I have been told by the Clerk's department they've gathered together and, for the past number of years, every other Thursday you went in for the paycheques. They were letting you win, and you owe them \$5,336.

His temper was interesting. I'll tell you, you don't know Alex until you go to a presiding officers' meeting and then you really don't know him until the other presiding officers have left, because then Alex tells you what he thinks, and he does so in a very direct fashion. You sit there and he tells you point blank and he goes through exactly what the rules and program are and how the rulings should go about. He would sit with me for a couple of hours on end sometimes going over important rulings, and then he'd look me in the eye and he'd say, "I don't know why I'm telling you this, because you're going to do whatever the heck you want anyway," pack up his books and head out.

But I learned to appreciate him, and why I learned to appreciate him is simply this: We come here as elected officials and we come here with the idea of providing parliamentary democracy for the people of the province of Ontario. I'm fairly certain most people would come here with the same background in history and knowledge of this place that I had, which was somewhat limited. So it's left to those at the table to provide us with the history and the passion that we care about for the people of this province to protect democracy.

Alex is one of those who has protected the democratic process in Ontario through a great number of Speakers and a great many parliaments and a great many members. He was someone you could go to when in opposition or in government and get a direct answer to a very direct question. He wasn't political by nature, but he was honourable by nature and he believed in what he was doing.

The people of the province rarely know this because they see us standing in our places speaking about the issues of the day, but they don't know about the people who sit at this table, not about the issues, but protecting the institution. That's the institution this man had dedicated his life to protecting. He's a fellow Etobicoonian — and I won't be able to say that very much longer, I guess, if that goes on, but with due respect to my friends, it's a pride we have in Etobicoke and a pride that we can point to people like Alex and the levels he's reached that makes us proud to say that he has represented not just the people there, but the people of this great province.

They say around the Speaker's chamber that Alex is truly apolitical, and he is. He doesn't like any of us. I went back quickly to the library and ripped off a few — you know, for a guy who's been here as long as he has, you go get his press clippings and it's a sparse package, because clearly he's been doing his job. His job is to ensure this place works and operates, but he's never at the front.

But the best I had — and this may typify Alex to some degree and his very, very, very short arms and his very deep pockets — but he went on a tour with the Legislative Assembly to Denmark and Sweden.

Alex is never quoted in the paper; five stories in 20-odd years. They were talking about the expense of this trip and the concern it was that the taxpayers were picking up the bill. I was reading through this story and there wasn't much there, and then I got down to the bottom where it said "despite Mr McFedries, the committee clerk, who said yesterday he spent more than 30 bucks for an ordinary meal in Stockholm." I think, Alex, that said it all. His claim to fame was blowing 30 bucks on a piece of veal in Stockholm and he was outraged at the cost.

Alex, I've enjoyed my time with you. It wasn't long enough. I know the Speakers, and I can speak for them directly, I'm certain. Your wisdom has been unsurpassed, your humour has been very helpful, and at the times when this job is the most difficult it's great knowing that you're sitting over there, and regardless of what's going to take place, you'll let me stand up here and make a complete fool of myself.

Enjoy your retirement. We wish you all the best.

1420

VISITOR

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Sitting in the opposition's gallery is the leader of the federal New Democratic Party, Ms Alexa McDonough. Welcome.

Mr Toni Skarica (Wentworth North): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: A man named T. Harry Thompson once outlined a basic principle of aging as follows: "Age improves wine, compound interest, and nothing else I can think of." The reason I point out that principle is there's an exception I would like to add to that list, and that's the Speaker himself, who is now the youngest Speaker in the House and will be so when he turns 40 this Sunday.

The Speaker: Thanks a lot. That's not even close to a point of privilege, but thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My first question is for the Premier. My first question in fact is to the man who with the utmost sincerity and conviction stared into the television lens during the course of the leadership debate that was aired province-wide on TV and said, "Certainly, I can guarantee I have no plans to close hospitals." Today the Premier closed 11 hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto and 14 emergency departments.

There is much confusion out there, but I think it's important for us to keep our eyes on the ball. In particular, there are three things we know for sure: We are losing 11 hospitals and 14 emergency departments, we are losing thousands of doctors and nurses, but at the same time there are going to be no fewer patients.

Premier, I'm from Missouri so you're going to have to show me. How is it that with the loss of thousands of health care workers, patient care is not going to be compromised?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I assume the member is responding to the restructuring commission's announcement today, the proposal of a relocation of a number of hospitals into other locations and into other buildings.

I think, from Liberals to New Democrats, all have applauded the need for restructuring. You, yourself, former ministers, Liberal ministers, the leader of the New Democratic Party and former members of the New Democratic Party have indicated that after 10 years or so of reducing all these beds and closing wings, it ought to be time we get a lot more maximum and beneficial use out of the existing facilities.

I would say that the proposal is out there now for 30 days. We all have an opportunity to respond to it —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Premier. Supplementary.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, I understand this legal fiction that somehow there's a commission out there over which you have no control, but the people of this province understand that when it comes to any locked door of any hospital in this province, it will be your fingerprints on that door, nobody else's.

Let's consider one of the victims of today's cuts, Women's College Hospital. That is an internationally recognized centre of excellence when it comes to high-risk pregnancies. It's a world leader in breast cancer research and treatment. That's where our mothers, our wives, our sisters and our daughters go for hope, and tragically that's where some of them have to go to die in dignity. Women's College is so distinctive that the World Health Organization has designated it as the only collaborating centre in the western hemisphere.

Premier, how can you possibly deny the people of this region this world-class resource?

Hon Mr Harris: I know the current member and many members of his party have suggested a rationalization of hospital services within Toronto. We now have a proposal by an independent commissioner to do some of that. I would suggest that if you have alternatives, if there were other hospitals you had in mind or your leader had in mind during the campaign, or if there's a hospital you suggest, I'd be happy to pass that on for you or you could directly pass your comments to the commissioner.

Mr McGuinty: You promised us, you assured us, you personally offered your guarantee that no hospitals would close on your watch. Hospitals are falling around us like flies.

What about the people who happen to be working there? You compare fired nurses to hula hoop workers. Let me tell you, hula hoop workers don't administer medication, they don't alleviate pain and they don't try to care for 13 people at a time by themselves; and by the way, Premier, health care is not a passing fad.

I want to come back to the first question again and allow you the opportunity to properly answer it. We know three things for sure today in Metropolitan Toronto: We're losing 11 hospitals and 14 emergency departments and we're going to lose thousands of health care workers, but we're going to have the exact same number of patients. Tell me again, Premier, how is it that patient

care is not going to be compromised as a result of your hospital closures?

Hon Mr Harris: I think if you watched the announcement today, the opinion of most health care experts was that patient care in fact would be enhanced, provided something took place, they said. They said these restructurings and mergings of bricks and mortar could lead to better health care, provided any savings that accrued from that were reinvested back into the community, into modern health care, into modern services, into nurses working in the community, and other areas.

We intend to live up to that commitment. That's the commitment we made in the campaign. We said, "Whatever changes take place, whatever savings accrue in any part of the health care system will be reinvested in the health care system," and we will honour that commitment.

The Speaker: New question.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I address my question to the Minister of Health. I would encourage him to be more forthcoming than his boss, who refers to health care as a fad, who dismisses the concerns of workers no longer having jobs in those important professions, and who is responsible for this hospital closing commission that hit Toronto like a tornado today and then hopes to get out of town.

Minister, you made the cuts: 18% cuts to hospitals. You provided the staff. Your ministry staff are working on this commission. You provided the formulas they're using to take away beds, not empty beds but beds with patients in them. Will you stand in your place today and agree that section 6 of the Public Hospitals Act, which says the minister may make any direction related to a hospital that the minister considers to be in the public interest, applies to you, that you're the Minister of Health, that if there are things found to have gone wrong because of the decisions today you will act as the Minister of Health to change them?

1430

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): On a day when the health care system needs the understanding of all members, fearmongering is hardly what is needed when a commission of experts has recommended some fundamental changes to improve the health care system.

I remind the honourable member that it was his government and the NDP that closed the 10,000 beds. You heard very clearly today from the commission that a third of the physical capacity of our 44 hospitals in Toronto was not being used. Yes, there will be fewer buildings, but there will be more services, including women's health services. There will be more services for children, modern technology, the newest drug therapies, and thousands of jobs available as we reinvest every dollar saved back into the health care system.

At the end of the day, this is all about patient care. Day after day we hear problems in our health care system. The commission today has set out a preliminary plan to bring us down the road to improving the health care system, and all members should be working with our health care partners to do exactly that, because the patients of this province deserve nothing less.

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): This government's programs have been a relentless attack on women, and today, of all days, on the eve of International Women's Day, we hear that Women's College Hospital will be closed, an institution that has been a paragon of excellence, a paragon of health care at its best.

Women everywhere fear that this hospital, which has as its central mission teaching, research, the health care of women, will find its mission diminished. They fear that the services the hospital now provides will be inaccessible to those women and the research that it does will not be available.

I want to ask the minister today, of all days, as a member of this Legislature, as a woman and as a mother of a child who frankly would not be here except for that extraordinary facility, will he not reconsider this misguided decision and ensure that Women's College Hospital and the excellent work that it does continues independently?

Hon Mr Wilson: On a preliminary review of the commission's recommendations in this area, I don't think \$10 million more money to be spent on women's health is something that's detrimental to women's health. I think it's a positive first for Ontario. The commission is recommending a women's health council to be world leaders and \$10 million to be world leaders in research.

Second, they recommend that Women's College Hospital move to Sunnybrook, which has brand-new buildings, beautiful facilities. They're recommending all of the programs, the people and the experts move up to the north end, that there be more money for women's health and that we make a better effort in this province to make sure that the focus of every hospital in the province is women's health; not just the focus of one hospital downtown but now, for the first time, a new focus on women's health in every hospital in this province.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): Mr Minister, your Health Services Restructuring Commission has recommended the closing of North York Branson Hospital. This is a cruel betrayal for the people this hospital serves and it is absolutely contrary to what the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council hospital restructuring committee recommended.

The staff, the board, the administration, in good faith went out and planned to restructure as an ambulatory care centre. Now we have a situation where seniors are going to be put in jeopardy, seniors are going to have their health care access restricted. They're going to miss the timely service that they got. What is your response to those people who are going to have their lives threatened by the fact that you are closing down a facility in an area that has a high degree of seniors and an area that is not going to be adequately served?

Hon Mr Wilson: I appreciate the concerns raised by the honourable member. The commission has made it clear, though, that there will not be one iota of less service, that there will be more services, that the 344,000 inpatient visits that are occurring now across Metropolitan Toronto will continue. They've planned to the year 2003, and they're directing government to plan also in a comprehensive way for the aging population, for the

growth in the population. In particular, seniors and women and children are the focus of their report.

If what the honourable member expresses is true about the concerns, that there may be a gap in service, I would ask him to make that submission to the commission within this 30 days, because they want to know if they've got something wrong and they want to get it right. Their hearts and their minds are leading us towards a better health care system and we all have to work towards that together.

The Speaker: New question, leader of the third party.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My question is to the Premier. The Premier seems to think that hula hoops have something to do with health care. He doesn't understand that hula hoops were a passing fad, whereas health care is a right in Canada and it's essential for a civilized society. The Premier also says that his health care cuts are about reducing waste and duplication.

Today your health care cuts are taking \$430 million a year out of health care in Toronto, with no guarantee of reinvestment, and you're chopping 6,000 needed nurses and health care workers. Premier, can you tell people what laying off 6,000 nurses and health care workers has to do with duplication and waste and what it has to do with your fascination with hula hoops?

Hon Mr Harris: If the hula hoop analogy offends any, of course I apologize. The analogy was the sentiment that times are changing. Perhaps I'd have been better to use the analogy that the head of North York General used talking about railways, that times have changed and transportation needs have changed and restructuring must go on.

I would assume that when the leader of the New Democratic Party supported as late as yesterday restructuring, closing some hospitals, that he was responding to this simple fact: One third of the capacity of Metro's hospital system is currently unused. Surely it would make sense to achieve whatever savings we can from that so we can reinvest even more money into home care, nurses, health care and new, modern medicine. That is the goal of the restructuring commission.

Mr Hampton: That you would compare essential health care workers to hula hoops shows to everyone that you just don't get it. You don't understand it. I'll tell you what makes people angry. You've taken \$800 million across the board from hospital budgets: \$430 million a year out of Toronto; Ottawa, \$126 million a year; London, \$70 million a year; Sudbury, \$47 million a year; Thunder Bay, \$30 million a year; Lambton, \$21 million a year; Pembroke, \$20 million a year. Over \$1.1 billion a year is what you've cut out of health care and we have not seen any significant reinvestment. That's what annoys people. They see the cuts; they don't see any reinvestment.

Premier, I ask you again, when are we going to see the reinvestment? I see needed dedicated nurses and health care workers going out the door, being laid off. When are we going to see the reinvestment that puts them back to work offering the health care services we need?

Hon Mr Harris: I appreciate the question because I know his party and this particular member have been generally very supportive that restructuring should take

place and we should take advantage of the dollars saved from those unused beds for reinvestments. To date, we have reinvested hundreds and hundreds of millions more than any savings we have achieved, as evidenced by the current budget: long-term-care reinvestment, 4,400 new jobs, most of them nurses, \$170 million; cardiac surgery, \$15 million; restored out-of-country coverage that you slashed, \$30 million; introduced \$70 professional fee; \$13 million in rural emergency. We've actually made these reinvestments, even though the savings that were announced today will not come, in many cases, for one, two, three, four, perhaps five years. In fact the health care budget will go up during this period because we're committed to reinvest first so we can achieve those savings that you were talking about.

1440

Mr Hampton: I'm hearing the Premier trying to pass off investments in long-term care that were scheduled three years ago and somehow reinvested.

What people are seeing in Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Ottawa, Toronto, London and Lambton is over \$1.1 billion being taken out of health care, and they have not seen any significant reinvestment whatsoever. People are also seeing the quality of their health care cut because you say we can't afford it. Meanwhile your government is giving some of the wealthiest people in this province a huge tax gift. Bank executives who have incomes of over \$3 million a year are getting a \$200,000 gift from your government. You've cut health care, you've cut health care workers; you give your wealthy friends a tax gift.

I ask you again, Premier, when are we going to see significant reinvestment in the health care —

The Speaker: Thank you. Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: I think there have been about \$1 billion of reinvestment announcements so far. The restructuring commission is calling for more, and we respect that. I don't know whether they've called for enough or not, but I think at the bare minimum the announcements they've called for to date we've responded to in kind.

I think we've received great marks. I recall watching a health care program by CBC across the country, and Thunder Bay was pointed out as a model of how you take savings from unused beds and reinvest them back into the community. So I am assuming that this member and this party, which has supported restructuring, which said over and over again that it's a shame to have a third of the beds shut down and the hospitals unused and not take that money and reinvest it in community care, in new medicine, in new techniques, in new drugs and in nurses — it's exactly what we are doing and continue to plan to do.

The Speaker: New question.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): I think I'll go to the Minister of Health, and I hope that we can get more than rhetoric. There was a point in the last question which the Premier didn't pick up on, and that's the crucial point of this whole exercise. It is flawed from the beginning. We all know now that the commission has recommended \$430 million out, closing around 2,000 beds in Metro, a minimum of 6,000 jobs gone, and yet all

that is based on an incomplete plan. The commission admits there is no rehabilitation services plan as yet, there is no long-term-care plan as yet and there is no labour adjustment plan as yet.

Minister, what is your logic of allowing this commission to go ahead and order the elimination of four chronic care hospital facilities and 161 chronic care beds without any kind of idea how the long-term-care needs of this population are going to be met?

Hon Mr Wilson: Let's go to the beginning. Let's go to Ruth Grier's, the NDP health minister's, letter of November 24, 1993 —

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order. Hamilton Mountain.

Hon Mr Wilson: As part of the \$26.6 million that the previous two governments spent on studies, the Honourable Ruth Grier, as the NDP Minister of Health in 1993, began this study when she ordered the Metropolitan Toronto District Health Council to "determine locally a reconfigured hospital system for Metro Toronto to determine the appropriate number and location of teaching and community hospitals," and in the terms of reference, "including the closure of hospitals, will be considered where appropriate." Those are the marching orders the previous government gave to the district health council that produced its report in 1995 and has culminated in the commission's report today, because the commission's report builds very closely on what the DHC recommended.

With respect to chronic care, there seems to be some confusion. It's good news for chronic care, the report —

Interjection.

Hon Mr Wilson: Yes, it does —

The Speaker: Member for Scarborough East, I don't believe that's your seat. It would be helpful if you were in it if you're going to heckle, and even if you're in it, you still can't heckle.

Supplementary, member for London Centre.

Mrs Boyd: Your points are absolutely moot. You did not listen to what I said. We are saying this plan is incompetent because it doesn't take a lot of things into account. It's your planning, your management, that we are concerned about. I'm reading from pages 87 and 88 of the commission's report. The commission says:

"The HSRC considers the broad spectrum of long-term care to include chronic care hospitals, nursing homes, homes for the aged and transitional care beds," and they go on to say, "The Ministry of Health has not yet introduced planning ratios to determine optimal levels of institutional long-term-care services, including chronic care, for the demographic mix in any community."

Mr Sinclair said this morning it would be April before they even put out a report suggesting that and there will be no decision made until consultation is done on that report, and yet he has ordered the closing of these beds and these facilities. Minister, what we're saying to you is that it's up to you to stop this bad management of this transition and restructuring of hospitals. What are you going to do about it?

Hon Mr Wilson: That's a real misinterpretation of what's written in the report. There will be no closures until all the plans are in place that the commission has

ordered. There are no closures in chronic care. Runnymede is to be converted to a long-term-care facility — a new hospital, folks. Salvation Army Toronto Grace Hospital is to be converted to a long-term-care facility.

Yesterday in this House, the NDP, which didn't add one nursing home bed in the entire time they were in government — the same with the Liberals — were calling for new long-term-care beds. This report puts hundreds of new beds into Metropolitan Toronto in facilities that need to be redeveloped because they're old and run down and they need to be modern and have the newest technology, and that's the road we're on today.

Mrs Boyd: Minister, I suggest you read page 116 of your own report. It says: Dewson Hospital, close as chronic hospital. It says: Runnymede Chronic Care Hospital, close as chronic care hospital. It says: Salvation Army Grace Hospital, close. That's nonsense.

Minister, you want to hide behind the commission, but no one is fooled. You designed Bill 26. You gave the commission its mandate. You gave it its powers. Minister, you are the one who has made no commitment to the future of long-term care as yet. You are the one who is saying you may not go ahead with the CCACs, you may not go ahead with the downloading of long-term care. In other words, no one over there knows what you're doing about long-term care, including you.

The manager of the replacement services in Metro says at least \$85 million is needed for reinvestment in long-term care, and yet the commission is saying only \$25 million as part of its report. Minister, what are you going to do about this?

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Scarborough East, that's out of order. I ask you to withdraw that.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): I withdraw it, Speaker.

Hon Mr Wilson: The paragraph the honourable member refuses to read out to the public here says:

"The commission recognizes that both Runnymede Chronic Care Hospital and the Salvation Army Toronto Grace Hospital have a long and valued tradition of providing long-term-care services. The commission is advising the Minister of Health to entertain proposals from these two organizations for the provision of more long-term-care services in new facilities."

To date, we have lived up to every reinvestment in previous commission studies that has been requested by the commission of the government. We will live up to these reinvestments. I think new chronic care facilities for the first time in many years of this province is an excellent way to serve the patients in this province, and I look forward to working with the commission once we're finished this 30-day period and making sure those new facilities are up and running.

1450

The Speaker: New question.

Mr McGuinty: My question is for the Minister of Health. I want to ask you about a hospital in my riding that you have decided to close, and what this question does is bring into question the criteria you are using in closing hospitals.

The Riverside Hospital is the seventh most efficient in the province; in fact it ranks in the top 3%. It's also accredited by the Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation for the quality of its services. Only 23 Canadian hospitals have received that award. That's 23 out of 1,800. That puts it in the top 1%, so it's top 3% provincially for efficiency, top 1% nationally for quality. The Riverside Hospital has got everything we ought to be looking for in a hospital: high-quality care for very low cost. Minister, tell me, why are you rewarding that by killing it?

Hon Mr Wilson: With respect to the Ottawa restructuring report from the commission, we're reviewing that report now; we're in the 30-day period. If the honourable member can make a good case why that particular hospital should remain and if it is as efficient as he says, I'm sure the commission will listen to that. The commission is recommending fewer buildings in Ottawa, but more services. I have quotes here from the Ottawa Citizen, from the Sun there, from Dr Wilbert Keon and from many of the leading experts in health care in the Ottawa-Carleton area, saying that the commission's report, on the surface anyway at this point, looks very good and bodes very well for future patient services in that area.

Mr McGuinty: I'm going to acquaint the minister a bit more with the qualities of this hospital. This past year over 30 Ontario hospitals sent delegations to the Riverside Hospital in my riding to find out how it is they do what they do so very well and for so little cost. Riverside has never run a deficit, and in fact, despite your cuts, it still has a balanced budget plan for 1996-97.

It's a 270-bed hospital, which makes it the optimum size for a hospital in Ontario. I can tell you that the doctors and nurses working there are excited by the fact that they've gone so far with so little. They brought a tremendous creative, entrepreneurial spirit to the job. Minister, given all this, can you assure me and can you assure the people at the Riverside Hospital that you will not allow it to be closed?

Hon Mr Wilson: Given that the report as it stands right now calls for the beds at Riverside, the expertise, the staff at Riverside to move over to the Ottawa General Hospital and the Ottawa Civic Hospital, where they have room for those services because they've got capacity there, I think on the surface it appears to make sense. But if the honourable member has another case to make, that is why we have this 30-day period. The commission must hear whatever facts and evidence you have, and in the end it will make a decision that's in the best interests of serving the patients, not the buildings, in the Ottawa-Carleton area.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): My question is to the Premier. Premier, this morning, as I'm sure you know, the standing committee on general government was dealing with clause-by-clause reading of Bill 103. I have to tell you, being a member of that committee, it was indeed just a sorry sight. The committee had no amendments before it from the government. We understand that

you have chosen to take some time to reflect on the events that have happened, including the result in the referendum, and I for one think that might actually turn out to be a positive thing.

But what I want to raise with you today is this: If that is the case, if you are contemplating, and in fact your own minister has said you will make some amendments to particular sections of the bill, if you won't agree to withdraw the whole bill entirely, then why do your members persist in voting through and voting on the bill as it presently stands?

I'll give you just one reference. Section 12 is the section that says, "The decisions of the board of trustees are final" and not to be "reviewed or questioned by a court." Why would you have your members continue to approve those provisions and many other draconian provisions in this bill instead of withdrawing the bill while you ponder what to do next?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I thank you very much for the compliment on respecting the wishes of the people, to take our time, make sure we get it right, make sure we have amendments that will respect those who voted in the process they had leading up to Monday and those who came before the committee in hearings.

We are faced with a process of putting forward an amendment without reflection and taking into account all those things we've heard and taking the time to reflect, or to wait and do that. The committee members and the government and the caucus have opted to take our time. I would not assume the bill, as it's going forward, is not amendable in any case. If you have suggestions to make sure that any section to do with the trustees is there 100% —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much. Supplementary. Member for Dovercourt.

Mr Silipo: Premier, no, let me be clear. This bill is not amendable. This bill can't be fixed by amendments. You should have the courage to withdraw it. That's the only way in which you can respect what the people of Metropolitan Toronto have said to you in the referendum on Monday.

What I'm getting at is this: You refuse to withdraw the bill, you say you're going to make some amendments, yet you continue to insult the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto by having your members in committee continue to act as if nothing happened and continue to vote in favour of section after section of the bill.

Premier, there's still time for you to show some good faith. If you are really reflecting, this afternoon when we go back and continue the clause-by-clause, will you instruct your government caucus members not to report the bill back in its present format? It will still be by order of the House back here, but it will show some good faith that you are at least beginning to hear what people said to you in the referendum. Will you at least do that, Premier?

Hon Mr Harris: I don't instruct committee members on this side of the House. I don't know whether you instruct your committee members. There is a process —

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Harris: I think it might be beneficial to spend the time today hearing thoughts from all parties on amendments that should or could be made. Your position seems to be, it's not amendable, but you're upset that there aren't amendments. I don't quite understand how that rationalizes, but I never understood how your government rationalized when you were governing and the \$11.2-billion deficit in any event.

If in fact the member has a proposal for the committee that is legal, that meets the intent and suggests that we report it as is and not deal with amendments this afternoon, I personally wouldn't be opposed to that.

Interjection: It should not be reported.

Hon Mr Harris: Well, I think to not move the bill forward and allow us the opportunity to amend it is not very responsible, because it is our opinion that it may very well be amendable and satisfy certainly not you but the vast majority of Torontonians. We will proceed that way. You know there will be substantial amendments, and if you would like input into that —

The Speaker: New question.

COMMUNITY CARE ACCESS CENTRES

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): My question is to the minister responsible for seniors. It concerns community care access centres, the government's one-stop shopping for seniors and people with disabilities to access home care services.

Last week the Premier asked you to help deliver and administer this government's long-term-care vision. I know in my own community that the Peel CCAC board has worked extremely hard to develop a system that will deliver the best services for seniors at the lowest cost. Can you, as minister, confirm that long-term care will be more accessible and less bureaucratic for our Ontario seniors?

Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister without Portfolio [Seniors Issues]): I want to thank the member for the question. I want to assure all members of this House that since assuming this additional responsibility, I've had an opportunity to talk to many of the volunteer chairs and the CEOs of the 43 community care access centres across Ontario to reassure them that this government is very committed, and will deliver on its commitment, to provide long-term-care health support services to seniors and the disabled in this province.

I'm pleased to report that seven CCACs are already fully operational in this province. They are today purchasing services for seniors such as home care, nursing visits and Meals on Wheels. This province is today spending \$1.1 billion a year on home care, which is \$3 million a day that this government is committing to seniors and those less fortunate.

The fact is that after a decade of waiting for the opposition parties to deliver on this program to seniors, false rhetoric and 10 years —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Supplementary.
1500

Mrs Marland: I'm aware that my own community care access centre's board in Peel submitted a business plan to you last week and that their plan does identify

real savings that will be reinvested in front-line services for seniors, for example, savings on lease costs and savings on fewer administrators.

I would like to ask you — and it was interesting, because the health critic for the third party just asked you this question across the floor — will the CCACs be up and running by April 1?

Hon Mr Jackson: I'm pleased to report that in the case of Peel, I have talked with the chairman, Barry Stranks. I reviewed his business plan last Friday night and I will be meeting with his board on Monday in order to proceed. They will make their April 1st day on which they will become a fully operational CCAC.

They have identified savings for taxpayers as they change from the vision of the opposition parties, which we stopped, their 100 multiservice agencies vision, which would have grown from the 74 agencies that are currently in existence. This government is delivering one-stop access for seniors by reducing administration and increasing services for seniors.

I have in my hand a document that says A New Agenda One-Stop Access for Ontario Seniors. This document was tabled by the government when the leader of the official opposition's father was a member of this Legislature. That's how long the people of —

The Speaker: Thank you. New question.

JOB CREATION

Mr Peter North (Elgin): My question is for the Premier. You would be aware that the St Thomas Psychiatric Hospital is closing. Hundreds of jobs will be lost. Municipal restructuring will be and is taking place in Elgin county. Again there may be as many as 100 jobs lost. With regard to education reform, we'll be amalgamating with London and a couple of other boards. It is a good opportunity for hundreds of jobs to be lost. The health care sector is restructuring. In that particular sector we're looking at a great many nurses who have lost their jobs already and we're looking at many more jobs that could be lost.

Premier, you've committed to 725,000 jobs in this province in this term. Can you tell me what percentage of those jobs is dedicated to rural Ontario and which sectors they'll be in?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I appreciate that some of the downsizing and rationalization in some areas are affecting every member's community. Certainly the member's riding of St Thomas has not been immune to that, nor has mine, nor have others.

We did commit to two things: In order to balance the books, in order to spend smarter, we committed that we would downsize in the public sector, learn how to spend smarter and get more for less. We believe this was also the most essential component, along with labour legislation changes and tax reductions, to growing the private sector and creating that climate for the private sector. It is our hope and intention, although we don't direct the private sector, that we will see substantially more growth in the private sector than reductions in the public, including reductions in municipal and federal public sectors.

To date, that has been the case. We have some net 90,000 or 100,000 more. As you know, in your riding a substantial announcement has been made in auto parts —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Premier. Supplementary.

Mr North: It's interesting that you should suggest that those opportunities will exist in the private sector. The concern we have is that in a community such as ours, in rural Ontario, when you lose so many professionals, whether those professionals are teachers, whether they're professionals in the hospital sector, whether they're doctors or whoever they may be, that has an impact on the private sector in our community.

Professionals are a valuable asset within our community, and when they leave, they take their spending power, their dollars and their investment in the community with them. That does not encourage the private sector to invest in counties like Elgin when we see the complete withdrawal of services by this government and the relocation of services to larger urban centres. Again, what I want to know specifically is, if there are going to be 725,000 new jobs, what percentage is for rural Ontario and what sectors will those jobs be in?

Hon Mr Harris: As I indicated, we can't direct the private sector but it is our belief that there will be a fair balance overall between rural and urban. Certainly with the restructuring of Toronto, we hope that they will be more competitive than they've been over the last 10 years and substantial will be here.

With regard to the member's riding, I think Magna has already announced hundreds of new jobs going into that area, so that would be in the auto. You're very well positioned in the auto parts sector, in the agrifood business, in a number of those areas. But the member is quite right: There is restructuring and there is change taking place last year, this year, next year and every year for the foreseeable future. We believe the changes we're making in cutting taxes, in labour legislation changes, in balancing our books, in dealing with WCB will lead to an even greater surplus of private sector jobs coming to Ontario, rural and urban, but I can't give you a precise number. I know your riding is doing quite well so far.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I want to direct my question again to our Minister of Health and I'd like him to live up to that title by taking responsibility, after his silence earlier of whether he would, for the hospital closing commission that was here today and his earlier remarks trying to claim that there are empty beds being closed. Minister, your cuts to hospitals are what have closed beds. It's your cuts that have closed those beds and now you say, "Now they're empty, we want to shut the hospitals." That's you, Minister.

Here's what you're doing: You've cut \$250 million. Already you signed those warrants to these hospitals in Metro Toronto. Now what you're bringing us is McHealth. You're going to kick people out of beds faster to clear out the room. That's what you're doing. It's drive-through health care. People are going to leave quicker and sicker because of it.

We want you to stand in your place and explain: Why is the Health Services Restructuring Commission only saving 5% from building closures and 95% from nurses and doctors and important health staff that aren't going to have work because of you?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): The honourable member knows full well that the Minister of Health or no politician makes the clinical decisions at hospitals. Doctors decide when patients will be discharged. I think our hospitals deserve a real pat on the back. The commission today went to great lengths, I think, to really commend the doctors and the nurses who are doing a tremendous job. Nobody gets better care on the face of this earth than in the province of Ontario, regardless of almost any clinical area that you look at. We deliver world-class care.

What the commission has said today is that it has found \$430 million in duplication, in empty space, in overhead, in administration, \$430 million, all of which will be reinvested back into health care. Mr Speaker, \$430 million buys you 10.3 million nursing visits a year and thousands of new jobs for nurses. If we can get that money out of those empty beds and into the patients' houses and into new hospital facilities that will be built —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you, Minister, very much. Supplementary.

Mr Kennedy: Minister, as you have all day, you disappoint. You disappoint because we want you to be the Minister of Health. We want someone on that side to be the Minister of Health. You are extracting what you call in your language "clinical efficiencies." You're responsible for how those hurt people. So far you've cut negligently, wilfully, from hospitals. We've heard stories here for weeks about people hurting because there's not enough nurses. Now you're cutting more. You're cutting tens of millions of dollars more and people will be worse off because of it. It's a wrenching experience to lose the hospital in your community. That's what happened to the people who live around Branson, the people who live around Women's College. It's happening elsewhere in this province, and it's happening because of you, Minister.

You need to take responsibility for your Premier's changed promise, that he's now closing hospitals. You're the one doing it. Will you stand in your place today and tell us that you'll stop the Americanization of the health system, that you'll stop bringing McHealth to Ontario?

1510

Hon Mr Wilson: Mr Speaker, for a health critic, it's shocking how little he knows about health care. His party closed 8,000 beds and left all those partially empty buildings standing to the point where we have fewer and fewer services available for people. We've got to get fewer buildings and more services. The equation is fairly simple and everybody else in the province but some members opposite seems to understand that we need more services.

There was a case raised yesterday in this House of six children not receiving chemotherapy at Sick Kids. Dr Goldbloom, in charge of those operations at Sick Kids, said it has nothing to do with the government savings.

That area is a protected area in our health care system. It was simply that two highly trained nurses called in sick yesterday and weren't available to handle the patients. So I'd ask the honourable members to do their research a little better. The commission is working along with others to have a better health care system with more services, and that's the direction we've got to go in.

ANTI-HATE GUIDE

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): The question is to the Minister of Education. Tomorrow the League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada will release its 15th annual audit of anti-Semitic incidents. As you know, this audit has shown a continuous increase over the last three years in hate and violent crimes across Canada, including an increase in hate group recruitment at high schools across Ontario.

I know your ministry has been actively involved and concerned about this in the past and in fact has asked B'nai Brith to help draft a guidebook for school principals and teachers to instruct them on how to handle these kinds of incidents that occur in their schools on a regular basis. This guidebook, as far as I have heard and know, has been available for a couple of months already. The question to you is, why are you holding it up?

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): I thank the member opposite for the question. Obviously the ministry has been concerned about this for some time, as am I and my colleagues and I'm sure everyone in this chamber today.

We are taking some steps. We have taken some in the past that I'm sure you'd be familiar with. We have released anti-hate material to schools. Boards have worked on this subject as well. We are now getting ready with another guidebook, another set of what we hope will be useful resources to combat this phenomenon. Of course, this phenomenon has been with us for some time, as I'm sure everyone understands. We are I think becoming more sophisticated in how to identify that and how to make sure our students are educated in an environment that does not include hate. So we'll be looking forward to releasing that guidebook.

Mr Marchese: Minister, I know that you have been doing some things, we have been doing some things, and that we created in 1994 a violence-free school policy. In addition, there has been the values, influences and peers program. We know that. That's not what I was asking you. I know you're concerned about this.

We have been, I should point out, going through the Internet in the last couple of days to view some of the things that connect very much to the particular issue I'm raising, and I'm going to ask for a page to come and get this material to show you because we are very concerned about what's contained here. I don't want to read some of the stuff that's here, Minister, because I find it offensive, and offensive enough not to be read out loud. I can tell you what we find here are the usual ringleaders like M. Zundel and M. Droege, including Mr Frum, who appear in print there, some of them with their pictures, with some of the things they have to say. We're very concerned.

What we want you to do, Minister, is to release this report you've got. You may not know about it. Please release it. The students and the principals need it now.

Hon Mr Snobelen: The member opposite refers to the VIP program. It's a program that we've done much to encourage. I know it had its origin in your government, and I salute you for that origin. We are preparing a guidebook to take on some of those issues and we are making sure that the distribution of that guidebook will be appropriate and that it is checked through with all of the stakeholders who are involved, that we've talked to the people whom we've consulted with in putting it together to make sure they approve it before it goes out.

I think that's a useful way of going about things. It's something our government is well known for, consulting with people, particularly with interest groups, before we take action, and we'll continue to do that as we have in other areas of the government.

TOURISM

Mr Tom Froese (St Catharines-Brock): My question is to the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism. Without a doubt, tourism is extremely important to the economy of this province as a whole and particularly in my riding of St Catharines-Brock. Many investors, businessmen and workers in my riding rely on tourism for their livelihood. The Niagara area is host to the annual grape and wine festival, which is attended by people from all over the world, the Shaw Festival and the Henley rowing regatta, just to name a few events.

Minister, with the Ontario tourism industry getting ready for the new summer season, can you tell the House what results were achieved last year, especially in attracting US and overseas visitors to Ontario?

Hon William Saunderson (Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism): I'm very happy to respond to the member for St Catharines-Brock. The tourism results for 1996 are indeed excellent and very good news for all Ontarians. The US visitors, as an example, were over 26.3 million to Ontario, which is up 3.8% over 1995, and overseas visitors climbed to 2.8 million, which is up 8.8% over the previous year. Tourists spend more than \$11 billion in Ontario annually and close to 370 jobs exist in the provincial tourism industry, and that produces \$1.7 billion in Ontario tax revenue, so it's a very good story.

Mr Froese: Minister, as you mentioned, tourism income is vital for all Ontario, including the Niagara region. What is your ministry doing to maintain and possibly improve these encouraging numbers of tourists choosing Ontario as their vacation destination?

Hon Mr Saunderson: My ministry is working very closely with the tourism industry both at home and abroad to encourage more growth in tourism, which would produce more jobs and more investment in the industry. The key overseas markets for our ministry are the United Kingdom, which rose 2% over last year; France, up 17.5%; Germany, up 3.4%; and Japan, up 7.8%. These are very good increases year over year.

My special tourism task force will be reporting to me very shortly on how Ontario can do even better in the

tourism industry, and our government will continue — and I want to say continue — to deliver the proper business climate which I think is essential so that the tourism industry will continue to thrive.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I have a question for the Premier. It's bad enough that your hospital closing commission announced the closing of 10 hospitals in Metro Toronto and closing down 14 emergency units in these hospitals, but what's most insulting and discouraging is that you compared the workers in these hospitals to obsolete factory workers who made hula hoops. What do you say to the families of these 6,000 nurses who are being laid off, what do you say to the families of the 6,000 hospital workers who are going to lose their jobs when you've insulted them by telling them they're obsolete and on top of that you've taken their work away from them? What do you say to them, Premier?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): Let me be very clear: You may be telling them I said that, but I would certainly never indicate that they are obsolete. What I indicated is what most professionals in the hospital system have indicated, including, I might add, the head of North York: that the current hospital structure is obsolete.

I would tell them it is my belief that should restructuring proceed, there will be many more jobs. I don't know if there will be more than may be lost through restructuring, I don't know if there will be less, but I think they will be of a more highly technical nature, perhaps even of a higher-paid nature, particularly for nurses, who we will be asking to take on more and more responsibilities.

I would tell them that I think restructuring will lead to many more jobs in the communities, as long-term care does. I know it's not easy for any worker in any field in any capacity to find that restructuring has caused them to move to another town or to another location or another job, as many have found themselves in that position.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much, Premier. Supplementary?

Mr Colle: Let me read back to you what you said yesterday. When they asked you about the closing of the hospitals, you said, "...just as hula hoops went out and those workers had to have a factory and a company that would manufacture something else that's in."

Will you not admit that this is going to affect real people and their children, their ability to pay their mortgage, basically their ability to make ends meet? What do you tell, for instance, the 700 people who are going to lose their jobs in my Northwestern Hospital in the city of York? What do you tell them to tell their kids when they go home for supper tonight, when you compare them to hula hoop workers? What do you say to them?

Hon Mr Harris: I say to them, with the greatest respect, the same as I said to the 12,000 you campaigned to lay off in the public service, the same as I say to the 10,000 the NDP laid off at Hydro. I say it is difficult; downsizing, restructuring, changing times are difficult.

I say the same thing to them as the employees who have faced this change within the civil service: that we'll be fair, we'll be reasonable, we will assist in any way we can. But we cannot stop technology from moving ahead, be it in mining, in auto manufacturing, in construction or in health care. Those are the facts we are faced with. We will do everything we can to assist transition from, for example, a job in a hospital to a high-paying health care nursing job in the community. We will assist to do that. It is not easy and they have our sympathies, but we'll do our very best.

The Speaker: New question.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I have a question for the Premier. Women in the Metro area are very concerned today about the recommended closing of Women's College Hospital. This is not just the loss of a hospital; this is the loss of an institution with a board and a staff focused exclusively on women's health. Without it, there would not have been the advances in research in women's health education and care that we have today across the province.

Premier, you realized that hospital restructuring has to be more than just a numbers game — which this whole exercise seems to be about — when you decided to intervene in rural hospital closures. Why don't you show Toronto and women's health the same consideration you showed rural hospitals and intervene and say this hospital is absolutely important to keep open for the sake of women's health across this province?

Hon Mr Harris: I know the Minister of Health has outlined that the restructuring proposal is for all the programs at Women's College Hospital to carry on and staff to carry on, in fact an enhancement of some \$10 million, I think, for brand-new programs to carry on.

What the restructuring commission did recommend is that they carry on in more efficient surroundings. I don't know if you are opposed to maintaining every program that's now available at Women's College Hospital, including staff, and enhancing them by \$10 million. If you are opposed to that, I suggest you let your views be known to the restructuring commission.

We on our side will suggest we're in favour of enhancing the programs and the services provided by Women's College Hospital, including maintaining the name and the programs and the staff and enhancing them. That's the recommendation and we'll be interested in your views.

FAIR MUNICIPAL FINANCE ACT, 1997

LOI DE 1997 SUR LE FINANCEMENT ÉQUITABLE DES MUNICIPALITÉS

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of Bill 106, An Act respecting the financing of local government / Projet de loi 106, Loi concernant le financement des administrations locales.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): We have agreement to move to a vote on second reading of Bill 106. It will be a five-minute bell; call in the members please.

The division bells rang from 1524 to 1529.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Order. All those in favour, please rise one at a time.

Ayes

Baird, John R.	Hodgson, Chris	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Bassett, Isabel	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Boushy, Dave	Jackson, Cameron	Saunderson, William
Brown, Jim	Johns, Helen	Shea, Derwyn
Carr, Gary	Johnson, David	Sheehan, Frank
Chudleigh, Ted	Johnson, Ron	Skarica, Toni
Doyle, Ed	Kells, Morley	Smith, Bruce
Ecker, Janet	Marland, Margaret	Snobelen, John
Elliott, Brenda	Martiniuk, Gerry	Spina, Joseph
Ford, Douglas B.	Maves, Bart	Sterling, Norman W.
Fox, Gary	McLean, Allan K.	Stewart, R. Gary
Froese, Tom	Munro, Julia	Tascona, Joseph N.
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Turnbull, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	Vankoughnet, Bill
Hardeman, Ernie	O'Toole, John	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Harnick, Charles	Ouellette, Jerry J.	Wilson, Jim
Harris, Michael D.	Parker, John L.	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hastings, John	Pettit, Trevor	Young, Terence H.

The Acting Speaker: Those opposed, please stand one at a time.

Nays

Bartolucci, Rick	Colle, Mike	North, Peter
Boyd, Marion	Cordiano, Joseph	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	Pouliot, Gilles
Caplan, Elinor	Kennedy, Gerard	Pupatello, Sandra
Castrilli, Annamarie	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Christopherson, David	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Churley, Marilyn	Lankin, Frances	Silipo, Tony
Cleary, John C.	Marchese, Rosario	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 54; the nays are 23.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Shall the bill be referred for third reading?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, this will be referred to the standing committee on finance and economic affairs for public hearings and deputations.

The Acting Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

PETITIONS**CLASS SIZE**

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and there are about 1,500 signatures on it.

"Whereas the private member's bill introduced by Rick Bartolucci, MPP for the riding of Sudbury, limits the number of pupils that may be enrolled in any class in any school in Ontario; and

"Whereas this limit depends on the grade level of the class; and

"Whereas studies have concluded that there are clear benefits from smaller class sizes; and

"Whereas there is greater student involvement and interaction in smaller class sizes; and

"Whereas there is improved student performance; and

"Whereas there is the opportunity for greater individualization; and

"Whereas smaller class sizes allow for more varied and constructive education for students;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support this private member's bill as it enhances classroom education."

I affix my signature to it as I agree with it. Now we are over 5,000 signatures.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I am presenting these petitions on behalf of the member for Algoma, our education critic, who is in Thunder Bay meeting with parents and education activists. This is a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the government of Ontario has introduced Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, into the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 104 seriously undermines the job security of caring professional support staff of the educational systems of Durham region;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to stop the process of outsourcing or the privatization of essential support staff, namely, custodians, maintenance, office, clerical, technical, secretarial and educational assistant staff. They are an essential service to the Durham Board of Education and the Durham Regional Roman Catholic Separate School Board and to the students of our region."

These are hundreds of over 13,000 petitions that I will be submitting, and I am affixing my signature as I am in agreement with them.

PORT COLBORNE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr Tim Hudak (Niagara South): I'm proud to present a petition on behalf of the people of Port Colborne concerning the Port Colborne General Hospital. After a lengthy preamble, the petition reads:

"That the Port Colborne General Hospital is a major economic engine in the city;

"That Port Colborne has an aging population which will need increased health care service;

"That a community without an active hospital is economically more difficult to promote;

"That the model that is proposed does not take into account the lack of a public transportation system in the Niagara region, which unfairly impacts on the good people of Port Colborne;

"That it can be identified that the citizens of the city of Port Colborne and the community of Port Colborne are receiving the greatest negative impact in the region from the recommendations contained in the district health council report."

On behalf of the people of Port Colborne, I affix my signature to this petition.

BIBLIOTHÈQUES PUBLIQUES

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Prescott and Russell): J'ai ici une pétition qui me provient de la bibliothèque de Vankleek Hill :

«Aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

«Étant donné que nous croyons fermement que la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en Ontario est un droit fondamental de tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes ;

«Nous, les soussignés, demandons aux membres de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario de sauvegarder la responsabilité provinciale dans les bibliothèques publiques en s'assurant de maintenir ce qui suit :

«(1) Les subventions provinciales qui permettent d'assurer à tous les Ontariens et à toutes les Ontariennes un accès équitable aux documents et aux services de bibliothèque publique ;

«(2) La coordination des programmes de partage des ressources tels que le système de prêt entre bibliothèques et l'accès au réseau Internet ;

«(3) Une politique permettant d'assurer l'existence du réseau des bibliothèques publiques de l'Ontario ;

«(4) L'aide directe de la part du gouvernement provincial au niveau du service, par exemple par l'entremise du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario-Sud et du Service des bibliothèques de l'Ontario du Nord ;

«(5) Une loi maintenant l'autonomie des conseils d'administration des bibliothèques publiques.»

J'y ajoute ma signature.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I have yet again more petitions from adult students who are very concerned about their adult learning classes being closed down. It reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the undersigned residents and adult students of Ontario, are concerned with the recent and future funding cuts to education in the province of Ontario;

"Whereas the matter of Bill 34 is likely to come before the Legislature in the near future;

"Whereas we, the undersigned residents and adult students of Ontario, in an act of protest against educational funding cuts in the province of Ontario and Bill 34, will not be attending classes on Friday, October 25, 1996;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"Ensure full funding for quality education programs, maintain a broad range of courses and programs for all students and invest in Ontario's economy by maintaining day school programs for adult students."

Although this petition sounds like it's dated, students are still continuing to sign petitions since this bill was introduced.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Ron Johnson (Brantford): I have a petition from number of concerned people in my riding. It reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:
"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine

the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I gladly affix my signature.

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): I have hundreds of petitions that are signed by Parkdale students because they're very much concerned about Bill 104. The petition reads:

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, provides for the creation of a school system that many parents and students feel will be detrimental to newcomers to Canada entering and using the school system; and

"Whereas Bill 104 provides for the privatization of many school board functions, from day care to care-taking, after-school sports programs and others, detracting from the quality of programs; and

"Whereas the newly proposed system by all evidence will have money removed from it, thereby removing teachers from the classroom and increasing class sizes, which will undoubtedly cause education to suffer;

"Therefore, we, the parents and students of Parkdale Collegiate in Toronto, demand that the Parliament of Ontario listen to our concerns and act upon them by overturning what we consider a poorly thought out piece of legislation. Withdraw the Fewer School Boards Act now."

I am signing my signature to this document.

1540

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I have a petition that reads as follows:

"As taxpayers, employees and constituents, we feel strongly that we need to address some issues concerning Bill 104. It is our concern that the outsourcing and privatization of custodial, education assistants, secretary, clerk or technical staff will be detrimental to the entire educational process for reasons too numerous to mention. All of these staff members provide service to our schools and community.

"For many students, the school community is one consistent and stable force in their lives. Support staff tend to many matters involving their education, health and safety and wellbeing, both inside and outside the classroom on a daily basis. Education and learning are not relegated to the hours spent in the classroom during the day. What message are you sending our young people if this government continues to promote the idea that support staff are not part of the education system?

"Therefore, in the interests of the future of the students of Ontario and continued support of our schools and communities, we ask you not to support the privatization issue contained in Bill 104."

This is part of over 13,000 education petitions that I am submitting today, and I affix my signature, as I am in agreement with this.

FIRE SAFETY

Mr Tom Froese (St Catharines-Brock): I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

It's signed by a number of people in my riding and also Thorold, and I think the member for St Catharines will sign it.

NORTH YORK BRANSON HOSPITAL

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): I have a petition to the Legislature of Ontario.

"Stop Hula Hoop Harris; Save our hospitals;

"Whereas the final report of the hospital restructuring commission has recommended that Branson Hospital be closed down;

"Whereas the closure of Branson Hospital will seriously jeopardize medical care and the quality of health for many seniors;

"Whereas Hula Hoop Harris doesn't seem to understand that unlike hula hoops, quality health care will never go out of style;

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reject the report of the hospital restructuring commission and stop cutting health in Ontario."

I've affixed my signature.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I'm now submitting the remainder of these petitions, and these are similarly or very close to similarly worded. There are over 10,000 here as part of the close to 14,000 I'm submitting today.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario has introduced Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, into the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

"Whereas Bill 104 seriously undermines the job security of caring professional support staff of the educational systems of Durham region;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to stop the process of outsourcing or the privatization of essential support staff, namely, custodians, maintenance, office, clerical, technical, secretarial and educational assistant staff. They are an essential service to the Durham Board of Education and the Durham Regional Roman Catholic Separate School Board and to the students of our region."

I am in agreement with the near 14,000 citizens of Durham who have signed this, and I'll affix my signature.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): I have a petition signed by a great number of residents in my riding. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the government of Ontario is proposing to restructure completely the provincial-municipal relationship without having consulted the people of Ontario; and

"This restructuring proposes to download to municipalities the cost of transportation and such critical social services as welfare and long-term care for the elderly and the chronically ill; and

"Removes school boards' ability to tax, eliminating any effective local control over schools and school programs; and

"The government's actions fail to guarantee existing levels of funding and fail to recognize the unequal ability of local communities to bear the cost of these new burdens, thus producing inequitable access to essential services; and

"Whereas the government's lack of meaningful public consultation and disregard for public response pose a serious threat to democracy;

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, because we care about the quality of life in our province and the wellbeing of our children, neighbours and communities, register a vote of non-confidence in the government of the province of Ontario."

I present this petition on their behalf. I do not sign it as I do not agree with it.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): I have a petition as well that is addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas acknowledging that institutions and taxation in Ontario should be open to review and improvement at all times; and

"Whereas acknowledging the fact that transfer payments from the federal government have been drastically cut and have resulted in an acute need for the overhaul and streamlining of the Ontario government's expenditures; and

"Whereas acknowledging that the education taxes will be removed from local municipal property taxes;

"We, the undersigned residents of Kingston, Ontario, and members of the Iyr Ha-Melech Reform Jewish congregation, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to abandon their proposed policy of downloading 50% of funding for social assistance, long-term care of seniors, the disabled, public health, social housing, transit and ambulance services on to our municipal government. Our mayor estimates that the city of Kingston will lose \$28.6 million from property taxes, which translates into an average increase in residential taxes of \$546 per household and a 42% increase in commercial property tax. Further, the competition for funding at the local level will create unbearable tension within the Kingston community."

This has been signed by some 50 citizens of the city of Kingston, and I attach my signature.

ST PETER'S HOSPITAL

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the site of the south wing of St Peter's chronic care hospital in Hamilton is in a dangerous and

deplorable condition and cannot meet the building and safety codes of our province; and

"Whereas the NDP government approved and announced the \$12.5-million funding necessary to replace the existing 80 chronic care beds in the south wing; and

"Whereas the Harris government supported the decision of the NDP government and subsequently approved and paid their half of the cost of excavating the hospital grounds; and

"Whereas on January 28, 1997, the Harris government ordered that all construction at the site be brought to an immediate halt, leaving a 20-foot deep hole the size of a football field with more than three feet of snow, ice and water at the bottom; and

"Whereas St Peter's Hospital is in the middle of a residential neighbourhood surrounded by three elementary schools and this excavated site exposes neighbourhood children to unnecessary danger and denies seniors the right to a safe and dignified quality of life;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly of Ontario demand the Harris government immediately reinstate the funding for St Peter's chronic care hospital in Hamilton and allow construction to continue."

I proudly add my name.

FIRE SAFETY

Mrs Brenda Elliott (Guelph): I present to the Legislature the following petition from several constituents in my riding.

"Firefighters need speed, experience and teamwork to save lives. I oppose any legislation that could undermine the work of my local firefighters and jeopardize fire safety in my community. Please listen to professional firefighters and amend Bill 84 to eliminate the threat to fire safety."

I submit it on their behalf.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The time for petitions has expired.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, I saw one of the Conservative members stand up with a petition and I would like unanimous consent to have one more round of petitions, if all three parties want to agree.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: We do not have unanimous consent.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): Pursuant to standing order 55, I wish to indicate the business of the House for the week of April 1, 1997.

On Tuesday, April 1, this will be an opposition day — the House will meet — in the name of the member for Rainy River, Mr Hampton.

On Wednesday, April 2, the House will resolve itself into committee of the whole House for consideration of Bill 103 and Bill 104.

On Thursday, April 3, the House will complete third reading of Bill 103.

On Friday, we don't normally meet but we will be meeting on Friday, April 4. The House will complete third reading of Bill 104, and with the goodwill of all the House I know we will probably have time to call Bill 57 as well.

1550

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DEVELOPMENT CHARGES ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR

LES REDEVANCES D'AMÉNAGEMENT

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 98, An Act to promote job creation and increased municipal accountability while providing for the recovery of development costs related to new growth / *Projet de loi 98, Loi visant à promouvoir la création d'emplois et à accroître la responsabilité des municipalités tout en prévoyant le recouvrement des coûts d'aménagement liés à la croissance.*

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The Chair recognizes the member for Fort York.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to continue on Bill 98.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): Still?

Mr Marchese: I have some time. I have a whole lot of time, and I'm glad, because there's so much to say. There's a lot to say on these matters. What I want to do is to give a little recap for the benefit of my friend from Mississauga South.

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: You heard it all. But for the benefit of some of the others who weren't here, the member for Nepean, I think the recap would be useful so you get a sense of how things link and how, from what I've said, I will lead to other conclusions in the second part of this comment.

You remember I was saying that Bill 98, like so many other bills, is really not for people or homeowners, as it claims, but rather for developers. It will benefit developers a great deal and homeowners not much. I was linking so many other things this government has done to other things, such as rent control. You remember that bill. It's the so-called tenant protection package, the Tenant Protection Act, a bill which has nothing to do with tenants and a lot to do with landlords.

You remember there, though the hearings, we heard a whole lot of people and one of the groups we heard from was the landlords and developers. They were urging this government and are urging this government to eliminate rent control completely because the decontrolling mechanism which kicks in once this law is enacted will mean that as soon as you move out of your apartment, you are going to face an increase once you move into wherever you are going. That's the worst part of that decontrolling mechanism and that's what we say is the beginning of the elimination of rent control, but it isn't fully the elimination of it.

The developers came there and said, "If you get rid of rent control, we will build housing." We heard from a lot of people who said, "They're not going to build housing."

Yes, they will build condominiums, luxurious ones, because there's a market for it. There are still a lot of wealthy people — because these Tories still have a lot of wealthy friends to build for — but there is no building going on for that sector of the population that makes \$20,000, \$25,000, \$30,000. There's no building because this fine government has cancelled all of our housing programs. They cancelled all the non-profit and co-operative housing, the only housing that is around that houses people who can't afford to live anywhere else, who can't afford a home, who can't afford the types of condominiums that the Tories are building and their developer friends.

You remember too as part of the point I made around amalgamation, Bill 103, I pointed out that the urban developers, developers in general, love to have the cities amalgamated because they don't have to go through the hassle of going from one city to the other. They stated as much when they came in front of the committee. Imagine the incredible hassles for these poor people to have to go from one city to the other to get a development permit for planning purposes. Imagine that. They're scraping the bottom of the barrel, they don't have any money, and it's getting harder and harder for these people to have to go to each and every one of those municipalities, wherever they are developing something.

So they came in front of the committee and they said to the Tories: "You're doing a fine job. You're doing great. Finally you have the courage, you Tories, to bring about something that's going to help business and it's going to help Toronto become a greater city than it is."

They came and they thanked the Tories, as we suspected they would do. They were asked, "Please come," because, you see, they only had a few people coming to that committee to support what they were doing. They had to find some people, so they found the usual crew of developers, the hotel industry and the like, friends of theirs of that ilk. They came and they did what they were probably being asked to do, supporting the government. But they don't have to do that. They came willingly, I suspect, because the agenda of developers is the agenda for Tories. They work hand in hand. In fact, I have argued that they are the shadow cabinet for this government. They are behind the scenes, manoeuvring like marionettes day in and day out. The shadow cabinet of these developers and other friends, the corporate raiders, is there behind the scenes, constantly manipulating and instructing this government on how to behave.

You remember as well that I talked about Monsieur Leach, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who last year unilaterally decided that he was going to relax the basement drainage protection rules and eliminated the full-height insulation requirement. He did that on his own.

Recall as well that I said that this is something around which municipal people, municipal civil servants, gather information from all of the experts, pass that information to each other so they can share it, and, once having the full benefit of that feedback that comes from the expertise of all of the people in the field, then make recommendations, but it has been, by and large, not a highly political task. It's a good thing too. It's important not to have

political interference in this area, because what you want is the expertise to influence your policies in relation to the building code, not to have developers come to you saying, "Minister, if you get rid of the basement drainage protection and if you get rid of the full-height insulation requirement, the new home owner is likely to save anywhere from \$1,000 to \$3,000."

So these people came, these developers. The Urban Development Institute went to Mr Leach and said to him, "If you do that, the homeowner is going to save a whole heap of money." So Leach, of course, in full agreement, consensually said, "No problem. I have no problem doing this unilaterally for you because it seems to make sense to me," I suspect. I can't vouch for all the wording that might have been exchanged between them, but I suspect it went something like that, where the developers said, "Do this. They're going to save money," and Leach said, "Yeah, it sounds reasonable. I'm going to do this unilaterally," bypassing the traditional process that has been engaged around the building codes for a long time before this government, before our government and before the Liberal government, with the old Tories, the red Tory types that we used to have in the past. So that's the process that was engaged in.

The point I wanted to make is the issue around credibility. Developers said to Leach, "The homeowner is going to save money." They do, and so I looked for evidence as to whether or not that really may have happened. So we went to the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance that did the investigation, brought together the evidence. The evidence said this, and I repeat: "A survey of home builders" that was released at their news conference that I attended "reveals that an earlier revocation of another energy efficiency standard" — the one I referred to earlier — "last summer did not reduce the pricetag of a new home by \$1,000, as Housing Minister Al Leach had claimed it would. In fact, the survey shows the prices being charged for these less energy-efficient houses are higher."

The evidence is quite clear in my mind. There were no savings. What you have done is you offloaded a new housing charge on to that homeowner who is buying that building without the benefit of the drainage protection and without the benefit of the full-height insulation requirement. So this person buying this home now, as of last year, who wants to put in full-height insulation, once she or he starts from scratch, is going to have to spend a whole lot more than \$1,000 or \$2,000 to do the job. Why is that? Because it's cheaper when you're building from scratch rather than adding something to the house later on. That's much more expensive. We know that. So clearly, on the issue of credibility, housing prices did not go down as expected, anticipated and predicted by M. Leach. In fact, the housing prices went up.

1600

The reason I raise this particular issue is because when I get to the development charges, this minister, the parliamentary assistant that has spoken, anybody else that will speak will tell you there are going to be a whole lot of savings for the new home owner. I've given you an example to show that is not the case and is not likely to be the case.

I want to bring another example, because I didn't have a chance to do that last week, and that has to do with the Planning Act changes that this government has engaged in. They have changed the Planning Act in ways that I think are going to be hurtful to the environment in particular and to urban sprawl in particular. The two are very much interconnected.

Our new policies that we had put in when we were in power replaced a patchwork quilt of ideas contained in other government documents and filled some of those gaps, which is what our bill did. It had six goals: to curb the excessive costs of low-density urban and rural sprawl; protect rivers, shorelines and other significant natural areas; prevent costly groundwater contamination; protect air quality and discourage more traffic; promote a variety of housing to meet housing needs; and protect quality agricultural areas. That's what we had done.

We thought they were good principles to abide by, good policies arrived at after four weeks of hearings. I was the Chair of that committee. We heard from a whole lot of people all over Ontario. We thought we had struck a fine balance that this government speaks of often. We thought we had found the balance. But this government has changed the rules once again. Where we had put in language that said that "the act shall be consistent with" provincial policies, this government undid that and went back to the old language which says "have regard to" provincial policies. We were afraid of that language. We thought that language was too flexible. It allowed municipalities a great deal of power to do what they want. It allowed a great deal of influence for developers to have on municipalities and municipal politicians. We were worried that the balance we had achieved through the bill that we had passed was being eroded by the new policies of this government that were passed last year.

We see the influence of developers everywhere throughout a number of policy changes that this government is making. This government is about to change building codes in a way that we think will cause new problems and new costs. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is proposing to reduce insulation levels in new homes by 33%. Efficiency standards in commercial buildings will be optional — not mandatory, but optional.

The Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance says that this will increase the cost of owning a typical new Ontario home from between \$3,000 to \$15,000, depending on your fuel type, over the life of a 25-year mortgage. This money will be spent on fuel produced mostly outside of Ontario.

The current energy efficiency provisions of the Ontario Building Code are based, says the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, on rigorous scientific analysis of cost-effective measures for homeowners. This may no longer be the case.

Mr Speaker, I'm not sure there's quorum in the House. You may want to ascertain that.

The Acting Speaker: I can check that. Would you please check that there is a quorum.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees (Ms Deborah Deller): A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The Chair recognizes the member for Fort York.

Mr Marchese: The Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance is extremely worried, and for good reasons. They have said, and I repeat, "Recent building code changes have been made in unprecedented fashion, ignoring the views of experts, manufacturers and consumers." How could this type of government do that? How could it ignore the views of experts, manufacturers and consumers? Why would it do that? For the sake of just pleasing a few people in the industry, the one I have mentioned for the sake of pleasing the Urban Development Institute types?

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: But it is. Why would they just do that? There are so many other manufacturers and experts who are your friends too. Some of them were not mine, I have to tell you. I went to this conference held by the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance. They were all business people, by and large supporters of yours. Some of them —

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: No, some of them are very strong supporters of yours, but they're afraid of you. They're afraid to come out and speak out. So I said: "Why would that be the case? If these are your friends, why would you be afraid to come and speak out?" They are afraid of this government because they have seen how autocratic it has been, how autocratically it behaves in every facet that I have seen so far. I've noticed it's a modus operandi, it is a modus vivendi for this government to behave in this autocratic fashion.

Others have used stronger language to describe the kind of behaviour and the modus operandi of your government, but I don't want to repeat that because it might offend some. "Autocratic" is something that many have used; many of them have used that. So people are very worried, including friends of industries that are very much connected to Conservatives.

You've got a big problem on your hands, it occurs to me. Bypassing in an unprecedented way the usual process of informing yourselves from the experts is, I submit to you, a serious mistake. Ignoring their views is even more serious. I say it because it is supposed to be a very non-political way of considering building code changes, and the minister, Monsieur Leach, interfered with that process last year, and I am afraid that he's not following due process with respect to the building code changes you are at this very moment engaged in. I'm afraid of that and people in the industry are afraid of that as well.

1610

Why do I mention all these things? I mention all of these things to say that we are seeing a transfer of wealth from the poor, whatever wealth was there, to the very wealthy. We are seeing a shifting from the poor to the wealthy, a distribution of money, whatever is left, from the poor to the wealthy. We are seeing tremendous gaps in Canada and in the US where the wealthy are becoming wealthier and the poor are becoming poorer. We are witnessing that in this province and in this country. We

have seen tremendous unemployment, and it is very high, unprecedented, and it continues under your government that promised 720,000 jobs or more.

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): Twenty-five.

Mr Marchese: Twenty-five: 725,000 jobs. You promised them, and under your government, which was going to be so welcoming to the private sector that the jobs would flow like water from Niagara Falls, I tell you the jobs are not flowing like water from Niagara Falls. In fact unemployment is high, stagnantly high, and it remains so under this government that pretends to say that it is the friend of the big private sector, of the corporate raiders. These corporate raiders were going to come in and they were going to create jobs for all Ontarians, and yet under this government we continue to have high unemployment. We continue to have massive layoffs from this government because of its policies. We're seeing it now in hospitals.

In the closing of hospitals we're going to see countless women, mostly women, nurses, who will be laid off to fend for themselves, and Mike Harris, the Premier, says, "Don't worry, they will find jobs." Those losses will be offset by other jobs that they will create; no, they don't see it and they're afraid.

The whole entire population of this province is afraid. That's why the economy has stagnated. It has stagnated because you have frightened the hell out of most of them. They are so frightened of losing their jobs that whatever few dollars they might have, they are not spending, creating therefore a sag in the economy. You people know, the Tories should know or ought to know, that it's because of consumer spending that the economy moves or does not move.

Because of your layoff policies, where you've laid off and continue to lay off people by the thousands — you have promised to lay off 14,000, gleefully saying that, and more, I argue; I suspect the number will increase to 25,000 people — you have hurt the economy and you have hurt individuals and families unlike we have ever seen before. Your fine Tory promise of those jobs flowing like the waters from Niagara Falls is not coming. We are seeing more and more part-time people working than ever before. We have more part-time workers than ever before.

Mr Ron Johnson (Brantford): How did you do?

Mr Marchese: How did we do?

Mr Ron Johnson: Yes. We know how you did.

Mr Marchese: We did well.

Mr Baird: You did well? You dug a well.

Mr Marchese: Just a moment here, my friend, mon ami de Nepean.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

M. Marchese: Le chômage, c'est ce gouvernement, c'est élevé.

Mr Ron Johnson: You're a joke.

Mr Marchese: A joke. The other member says, "A joke." I've got to find out where he's from. Where is my good friend Frank from? Not Frank — Ron from Brantford. It's good to see you here, Ron. Ron, listen. I have no doubt that no one believes that you're a joke, no doubt at all. I am convinced that people from Brantford believe and hold you in high esteem, and when they see

unemployment at these levels they say, "Ron, we thank you for having unemployment as high as it is." When they get fired and hospitals are closed, I am sure they will still hold you in high esteem and are going to say: "We're not going to laugh at you, Ron, because we know you guys are doing great. Unemployment is at unprecedented levels, but it's not your fault, Ron."

Unemployment is not your fault, but you guys were going to cure the unemployment problem. You boys — mostly men here today, except Margaret, who's here from Mississauga — said you were going to cure this problem of unemployment because you guys had the tools and the knowhow, the economic knowhow —

Mr Tom Froese (St Catharines-Brock): We didn't say that.

Mr Marchese: You didn't say that? Mon ami, you said you were going to create 725,000 jobs, and you said that with a great sense of knowledge and omnipotence and omniscience. They knew better; they were going to create this magic of employment out there.

Don't worry, they've still got two years. The magic is yet to come. Sometimes the wand needs to be shaken a little bit harder to create those jobs. But I tell you, this Tory alchemy is not working. It may have worked in the midst of the 17th century, but it's not working today. You people came in, this government, promising jobs unlike ever before, like the Tories before you at the federal level. I remember vividly when they said, "The North American free trade agreement is going to create jobs and prosperity." I remember Mulroney with his deep voice, "Prosperity for all," he would say.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): You don't understand; that's the problem.

Mr Marchese: The member for Durham Centre is the only one who understands here. He is omnipotent, omniscient, like Mike Harris. I have to tell you, Mike Harris and his clones are not solving the problem for us, even though they promised they would. I remember you saying that. I remember Mulroney saying, "The North American free trade agreement: Open up those borders and the jobs will flow." My friends, have you seen those jobs? Yes, they flowed downwards like Niagara Falls; they flowed downwards. We didn't have any jobs here.

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): Get on the subject, for goodness' sake. You're talking about foolish stuff, not about the bill.

Mr Marchese: I'm not talking about the bill? But I am. I'm going to talk about the bill. The member for Peterborough is here and I thank him for being here, because he was here on Monday and I'm glad he's here to listen to the debate. He says what I'm talking about doesn't connect. Well, I want to connect it for Monsieur le membre de Peterborough.

If the member was paying attention he would know from the evidence we have gathered that the savings Monsieur Leach said would be had if we eliminate the full-height insulation and the basement drainage requirement — if you would believe the minister about the savings, you would believe the minister when he says that when you reduce the development charges there are going to be savings to the homeowner, to the extent — right, Mr Kells? You're nodding — of possibly \$20,000.

Correct, Mr Kells? That's correct. The member for Peterborough, am I connecting?

Mr Stewart: At least you're talking about development charges. That's fine.

The Acting Speaker: Order. I would ask the members not to indulge in their conversations. I would ask those who are in debate to address their remarks to the Chair, please.

Mr Marchese: I thank you for the usual good guidance you give us, Mr Speaker.

The point I make is that things connect. You members try to disconnect things one from the other, of course, and what I try to do is to connect them, to show how you fine, honourable Conservative members are influenced by the shadow cabinet developers. You are one of them; you know them because you were there.

On the development charges, we want to look at credibility and whether there is any credibility to this, and that's why I used the other example. I want to speak briefly on the proposed revisions to the Development Charges Act. It will mean municipalities must pay for 10% of the cost of such services as sewers, water, transit, fire and police. Municipalities that build other projects such as libraries, museums and arenas must pay 30% of the tab. So it is true that development charges have not been completely eliminated. They've been eliminated for some areas; reduced by 10% for such things as sewers, water, transit, police and fire; and reduced by 30% for such things as libraries, arenas and the like. That's what they're doing with this particular bill. We appreciate that. We understand that.

1620

What is the point of this? I think the parliamentary assistant, who is from Lambton, talked about how this will serve the needs of Ontario and will make homes more affordable. What else did he say? I took some notes here a while ago. "Minister will make changes if they make sense, he argues." I'm not sure about that. I'll touch on that when we get there.

But by and large the significant point of this bill is to reduce the cost to the new home owner. What it does is make something that was discretionary and now make it mandatory. I want to speak to that, because I think it's significant. I hope the member for Peterborough is listening, because I'm speaking to the bill now more directly.

Mr Stewart: With bated breath.

Mr Marchese: I know.

The fact of the matter is that it used to be discretionary and now it's mandatory, meaning some municipalities could decide, based on their needs, to apply the development charge as high as they might want or as low as they might want, depending on the specific needs of their communities.

I feel that discretionary power is important. I feel it is extremely important. But you have taken that discretionary power and have now made it mandatory, taking the flexibility away from the various municipalities in Ontario to be able to provide the full services they need. This government and this minister and these other members here are arguing: "This won't prevent people from building. Developers will still build in the urban sprawl fashion as they always wanted to. Not to worry."

But I tell you this: There are a whole lot of people who are very worried about what you have done, and these are friends of yours, Mr Kells. You know them. Hazel McCallion is a friend of yours, I presume, in Mississauga. No friend of mine, no friend of ours, politically a friend of yours, and she was very worried.

I want to quote some people from the various municipalities. I've got one here from the Ottawa Citizen where a number of people have made different comments. The mayor of the city of Gloucester said this:

"It's likely that a lot of libraries and arenas won't be built if municipal taxpayers are required to cover a fixed 30% of costs of so-called soft developments. The current system,' she explains, 'allows municipalities the flexibility to determine the ratio between development charges and taxes on a project-by-project basis.' She said, 'The new legislation appears to remove that flexibility.'"

"Cain was surprised that a Conservative minister would suggest that taxpayers generally should pick up more of the costs of growth."

It's people like that you've got to worry about, because they are very concerned about what you are about to do to their municipalities and to the services that were being provided by this charge, elimination of which is likely not to produce the same services that every community should be enjoying.

Because this government has cut municipal funding by 40% in the last two years, those municipalities are strapped financially now more than ever. You have incapacitated municipal governments in ways that you cannot understand. You promised these people a whole lot of tools, but that toolbox was empty. There are no tools left for this government except the cuts that you have forced upon them; 40% cuts you've forced upon municipalities. Then you say municipalities can do them or not do them if they wish, that municipalities are not prevented from developing because of this measure.

Communities that have been fleeced by this government know that they've got a lot to worry about, because through this bill you are taking away a very important tool they had in order to be able to finance incredibly needed service for any new development that is likely to sprawl beyond the Metro borders.

The new plan would bar municipalities from imposing development charges for city halls, museums, hospitals and theatres, tourism facilities or parkland acquisitions. This is now no longer the scope of development charges, so these matters are completely out of the scope of development charges. Development charges cannot be levied for these purposes; that specifically is out of the bill.

This is from the London Free Press. "While the government contends that lower costs to developers will trickle down into lower housing prices, even developers" — Monsieur Kells, it says here — "concede the formula is more complicated than that."

"There are market issues involved there,' says Knutson, 'a lot of builders are just staying alive.'" They're saying the margins are thin, this other person says. "But Hopcroft is more blunt. 'I would hope that if we lower the development charges by \$300, the developers will reduce the prices of homes, but I doubt it.'" Ron, I doubt it very much.

Monsieur Kells, I'm not saying this. I'm quoting from various people. I will pass this down to the person who's recording the various names very shortly. These are people in the field. Even developers are saying the savings as a result of these reductions are not likely to trickle down to the homeowner.

Mr Morley Kells (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): That means they want bigger ones.

Mr Marchese: Bigger what?

Mr Kells: Bigger reductions.

Mr Marchese: Bigger reductions, no. But if the developers want bigger reductions, what you're doing is fleecing not only the homeowner but those very communities that depend on the development charges. If you cut down development charges even more, Ron from Brantford is going to be awfully unhappy.

Interjection: No, he's not.

Mr Marchese: Oh, yes, he is. He's already unhappy now.

This is quoting a person called Hopcroft. "The new plan is a serious setback to the relationship between municipalities and governments. We were promised more tools to conduct our business, amid serious provincial cutbacks, and this is a serious limit on that."

This person is right. Mr Kells, you might say yes, you might say no, but these are not my friends. Ron, these are your friends, the member for Brantford, who is sitting close to me. This is the deputy mayor, Grant Hopcroft, from the London area. I suspect they're closely connected to you guys, and they're very worried.

1630

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): Oh, he is.

Mr Marchese: He is. Is that correct? The member for London Centre is —

Mrs Boyd: Any member of the Crombie family.

Mr Marchese: There you go. These are the people who are speaking out against the policies of this government in this regard. They're saying, "We had a tool and you're taking it away." They're saying, "You cut out 40% of our municipal funding in two years, and then the only tool we've got to keep on sustaining our communities, with all the facilities that any community wants, you're taking that tool away." I don't get it. I don't get it at all.

Someone asks here, from the London Free Press again, "What is the motivation for this act?" What is the motivation? They ask it and I ask it. What is the motivation? Is it to save money for the new home owner? If even the developers are saying this is not going to trickle down to the homeowner, then what is the motivation of this bill except to please your development friends that continue to have good lunches, I suspect, at some of these fine places?

Interjection: You know the fine places, Rosario. You've been there.

Mr Marchese: I don't know them very well. I know some, but I tell you, some of these ministers, including Monsieur Eves, he knows them very well, I tell you that. And over lunch —

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: Who knows who pays there. Who knows whether it's the public purse or the developer. I

hope it's the developer because they've got money. They're doing okay.

What is the motivation of this bill? Even if developers pass the savings from a lower development levy to consumers, a cut of a few hundred dollars is unlikely to create a consumer stampede for housing. I agree with that. If they take these thousands of development charges out, they go straight into the pocket of your developer friends. So that poor homeowner who could indeed use a break is not going to get it.

Mr Kells: All those jobs you're talking about are in construction.

Mr Marchese: If people are buying houses or not buying them does not depend on development charges, Mr Kells, and you know that very well. The market and interest rates — Monsieur Kells, attend to this. Mr Speaker, for your benefit, if interest rates are low, as they are now, people will buy. That's why people are buying, because interest rates have been low for a long time. Why would you —

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: Mr Speaker, Ron is getting loud; he's vociferous. You've got to get him away from me. He's right here. It's not his appropriate seat. Get him away from me.

It is the interest rates. The reason why people are buying is because they want to take advantage of the interest rates that are low, and they are afraid interest rates are going to go high, hopefully — not hopefully. God, not hopefully. They're saying hopefully not in the next year, because they want to take advantage of low interest rates that will permit them home ownership. But the development charges are not going to save them one cent.

So the motivation for this bill — I ask the public that's watching this, ask yourselves whether you believe this government or you believe the number of different people who are commenting on this who are absolutely worried about what's happening to us all.

I want to quote a few other people who are very worried about this too. Councillor Bill Fisch from Markham estimated the revenue shortfall to Markham over a decade to be as high as \$200 million. He called the possibility of a tax boost as a result absolutely unacceptable.

Councillor Peter Healey, acting Aurora mayor, who attended council as an observer, said Aurora officials reckon the town hall will be out \$14 million over a decade, a period when it is expecting —

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Will the member for Brantford take his own seat, please. I'd like to remind members that there is no heckling, least of all when you're sitting in someone else's seat.

Mr Marchese: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Councillor Peter Healey was saying that they reckon they will be out \$14 million over a decade, a period when it is expecting 15,000 new residents. Can you believe that? They're expecting 15,000 new residents. If you're going to develop in these areas — because that's where people are developing — they need all the facilities that any other community that is established wants and deserves.

Georgina mayor Rob Grossi said no more applications will be accepted for development in his town until such

time either. York region's population of 604,000 is expected to grow to about 1.1 million by the year 2021. Officials reported in June that the region must spend at least \$2 billion on infrastructure over the next 25 years. That's a lot of money. It's a lot of money and you're taking away the only tool they've got.

Some of you have argued — and I don't remember who it might have been — that some municipalities have hoarded a great deal of money, and I think the reference was to Hazel McCallion. But that, in my view, is a responsibility —

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: Yes, she did. I forget the figure but evidently they've got, I'm not sure, quite a number of hundreds of millions they've accumulated over the years because of this.

Mrs Marland: They have \$400 million all in reserves. It's all designated.

Mr Marchese: Okay, \$400 million. I think most of it is because of development charges, but I say that's good. I don't say it's bad. Margaret, I think that's a good thing. I don't want to take anything away from that mayor. Of course, she says proudly that they've been able to keep taxes down as a result. That's fine. God bless. But it's up to the municipalities, to the people of Mississauga to make their mayor accountable with respect to the money they have raised through development charges for their community needs. They are the ones who should hold the mayor accountable. We should not take that tool away from Mayor Hazel McCallion in order to use money as their council deems fit for their communities.

Mrs Marland: Rosario, it's only for capital, not for operating, so it's not a tax thing.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr Marchese: The point is that money is raised out of development charges and then is used for a variety of purposes. I argue that the municipality has that responsibility as representatives of their community to discharge that money however they deem fit. If the community decides that the money is not spent wisely, it's up to them to make them accountable.

But I don't say take that tool away. I don't say take away this tool, one of the few tools they've got, given the serious cutbacks this government has inflicted on municipalities. I don't say take the only tool they've got away. But that's what you're doing.

This councillor from Markham, called Fred Cox, said, "The politicians at Queen's Park" — and he's not referring to me, by the way — "are caving in to the developers." This fellow is from Markham. I don't know him.

Mrs Marland: But Don Cousens would know him.

Mr Marchese: I'm sure Don Cousens knows him. I've got Don Cousens in one of these news clippings and I want to quote him, if I can find it — a good friend of yours; you remember him. I hope not to have misplaced it, because he's in these quotes. Don Cousens, a close cousin of yours now as a municipal councillor.

Mrs Boyd: Kissing cousins maybe.

Mr Marchese: Kissing cousins; there are so many variations of that word.

That's what Fred Cox said. They said the amendments will not reduce the price of houses. I am not the only one

arguing that prices are not going to go down. A whole lot of people connected to municipal government and to developers know that the prices are not going to go down. It will not reduce the prices at all. Richmond Hill Councillor Gail Blackburn suggested the amendments are one issue that will draw everybody together. "I can just imagine the grass-roots revolution emerging." On development charges alone, this person, Councillor Gail Blackburn, says, "I can just imagine the grass-roots revolution emerging." I understand why.

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: Ron, you would understand from your town of Brantford. He would understand that a revolution will rev up on this issue because they're losing the only tool and the only few dollars they've got to be able to maintain services. That's why they speak in such strong terms.

1640

I would hope that Mayor Cousens has been communicating to Monsieur Leach on this matter. I hope the door is open to him at least, and I hope the door is open to a lot of those councillors who are, once again, your close cousins on these and many other issues. I hope the doors are open for them, if not for us.

Let me find a few others here while we are quoting. Georgina mayor Rob Grossi told the meeting he will ask his council to stop accepting development applications, "I am suggesting to my council we stop right now," as did Hazel McCallion. As soon as this government decided to take the only tool away from these municipalities, Hazel McCallion, a warhorse, was there.

Mr Baird: Hey —

Mr Marchese: I mean that in the sincerest of ways. I will rephrase it: a stalwart, a hero of many causes, and this is one of them. This is a cause that she has taken on. She's taken it on like the soldier that she is. She is quite an active soldier. The war is always waging there with Hazel and it's waging against this government on this particular issue, and I mean that with respect. We disagree often on many issues with Hazel, as some of you know, but we respect our political differences. I just wanted to remind you that on this particular issue in Mississauga, in Markham and so many other regions outside of this metropolitan area, people are awfully worried. They said to you, "Development ceases because we cannot afford to provide the services we were able to provide, as you take the only tool that we've got away from us."

"Tax rates and water and sewer charges," as Sandra Cartwright, region treasurer, told the council, "would have to contribute 10% of the net capital costs of water, sewage, roads, police services, hydro and fire services and 30% of recreational facilities, libraries, community centres and park development."

"What is happening here is the worst thing that can happen," said Newmarket mayor John Cole. Mississauga Mayor Hazel McCallion has already hoisted the battle flag to rally the defence against the amendments submitted to the Ontario Legislature on November 25 by Monsieur Leach. She said, "It's a declaration of war with Mr Leach."

Them is fighting words, and I understand. I understand, because you're taking away what they need. They need to have those facilities. They need to have those amenities that every other community enjoys and they won't be able to do it.

If Tory municipal councillors are telling you this, you should listen, because I know if they were social democrats or socialists or Liberals, you would of course completely disregard them. I appreciate that. But because they are Tories, they are asking you and I am asking you to heed their advice, and their advice is quite clear.

My assistant, who is an architect part-time, has talked to a number of developers. She said that there was very little chance that any development charge savings would be passed to home buyers. The price of housing is set by what the market is prepared to pay, and the development industry keeps whatever is between the cost of building housing and that sale price.

Right now those margins are very tight as the most active market is to first-time buyers. Everyone is predicting increases in housing costs in the near future because of the pent-up demand for the product. As the traders become fully employed again, there will be pressure for wage increases. However, the current mini-boom in house construction will evaporate if interest costs jump and mortgage costs go up beyond the range of first-time buyers.

The prediction of a number of people that she spoke to is this: Municipalities will not deny development because they are unable to provide the necessary community amenities, schools, libraries, parks, day care. Instead, developments will happen without proper social services.

So what we're going to see is development, and we will see development happening in the GTA without the appropriate services they need. I find that pitiful. I find it pitiful that it should be this government that does it to the greater Toronto area, pitiful that this government is about to disregard even the opinions of their friends.

The parliamentary assistant said, when he made a statement Monday I believe: "The minister will make changes if they make sense, and they will listen to reasonable concerns."

Do you have any faith at all that they might listen to reasonable concerns? I don't have any faith. We were just dealing with Bill 103, and we heard 600 deputation, mostly individuals, who came with a great interest and desire to maintain local government — 600 of them. I have never seen so many people wanting to speak to a particular issue. They came with a great deal of passion, dedication and a desire to maintain local government. They said, deputation after deputation, "Please withdraw Bill 103, withdraw because it is a bad bill, withdraw because we don't want it, withdraw because we don't like it, because it's going to hurt community development, community identity, local democracy." They said that over and over again.

Then we had the referendum and the referendum was much clearer yet. It was overwhelming in its desire to say no to Bill 103. So when the parliamentary assistant says, "We will listen to reasonable requests or reasonable arguments or reasonable changes," do you for one moment believe them? I don't believe them.

The minister and the Premier came back after that vote on the referendum and said: "Yes, we're going to listen. We're going to make amendments. We're going to make changes." But that's not what the deputations said. They found abusive and very unsavoury some of the elements of Bill 103, but they found the entire bill unsavoury and unacceptable. They didn't come to the committee to say, "Amend the bill"; they came to say, "Eliminate the bill." The ballot on the referendum was very, very clear. The ballot on the referendum was clear as to whether they wanted to retain local governments or to be amalgamated. It couldn't be clearer.

I asked many deputants: "Was the question confusing? Did you understand it? Was it ambiguous? Did you know what you were doing? Were you not influenced at all by the Conservative government's newsletter that was sent out to you, that was completely unilateral, one-sided and propagandist? Were you not influenced by that?" They said, "No."

Hon William Saunderson (Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism): You told them what to do.

Mr Marchese: Mr Saunderson, the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism, says we influenced with a one-sided view. Well, they tried too with a whole lot of bucks that are at the disposal of a provincial government. But they weren't influenced by that. The public was not convinced by that slick, expensive propaganda put out unilaterally by this government to try to dissuade them from opposing them. Overwhelmingly they came and said no. So when the parliamentary assistant says, "We will listen to good arguments, we'll make changes accordingly," we don't believe them.

1650

I want to try to sum up by saying this is not a bill that is going to promote development. Development will happen if the demand is there. Tories should know that because they pride themselves in understanding economics. They should know that development continues or is there if the demand is there. If people have the money, if interest rates and mortgage rates are low, they will buy. If people do not have the money, it means demand is not there; therefore supply does not make sense. It's simple economics. Tories usually pride themselves in understanding that. It is not because of development charges that we haven't seen building in the past. They were building to the extent we had a market out there that was willing to buy, to the extent there was demand.

This bill is nothing short of pleasing their developer friends, because these poor people have been scratching and scraping for years, and they finally came and instead of whacking the people who've got money they whack people on social assistance with a 22% cut in their benefits. Instead of taking from those who have great wealth, they take from those who have so little. Instead of giving an income tax cut to those who earn less than \$30,000, they give an income tax cut to their banker, their developer, the corporate friends they've got, being sucked away by their rich, privileged allies, Tories all — some Liberal, I suspect.

This bill serves the interests of developers, not the homeowner. This bill will not produce one new house as

a result. This bill will impoverish municipalities. This bill will incapacitate municipalities to provide basic amenities that every municipality needs and ought to have and desires.

Mr Speaker, I thank you for your attention. It's a pleasure to speak to this bill.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mrs Marland: In responding to the member for Fort York, I would say at the outset that I really would like to suggest you not refer to the mayor of Mississauga as an old warhorse. Mayor Hazel McCallion is one of the most dynamic mayors in Canada and she actually is more a young general, I would respectfully suggest, than an old warhorse. I would challenge anyone in this chamber, including myself, to keep up with her commitment to her people and the service of the city of Mississauga. Since she became mayor in 1978 she has been a forthright, dynamic leader; 19 years as mayor.

Just to respond, it's very difficult in two minutes to respond to your overall comments which you had an hour and a half to deliver. In fact during that hour and a half you strayed a long way away from Bill 98.

Mr Marchese: Did I?

Mrs Marland: Yes, you did. You referred to the people on welfare and the reduction in the welfare rate in this province. I am very proud to say that in this province today we now have 200,000 fewer people on welfare than we had a year and a half ago when you were the government. How much better for those people to be working, to have their self-esteem and to have the confidence that they can earn a living for themselves.

The other thing in terms of building is that I would remind you how much you added to the cost of housing in this province by requiring the extra height in the basement so people could live in basement apartments.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): I would just invite the member for Mississauga South to Oakville on March 24, when undoubtedly Mayor Hazel McCallion will be giving a presentation to this committee, because that's when the committee will go out travelling.

I'm sure Mayor McCallion may not speak so kindly about this particular bill because she certainly is happy with the current system, and as for the current system — let's remind the people of Ontario once again — we're taking away in this bill the powers from the municipalities, the municipalities on which \$6.3 billion worth of health care, social services, ambulance services and many other services have been downloaded by this government.

We're saying to those municipalities, municipalities that this government claims to be in partnership with, "Municipalities, you can no longer make your own deals with the developers for what's good for your municipality." Let them work it out themselves.

The real reason is that this government doesn't trust municipalities. They feel they are doing the dirty work —

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I am singing on a point of order on the Q and A time, because this member did the same thing to me a couple of weeks ago, but mainly the point of order is that in Q and A you're supposed to respond to the previous speaker, the member for Fort York —

The Acting Speaker: Order. Please address the comments —

Mr Gerretsen: I would just like to remind the people out there that the member for Mississauga South was wrong when she indicated to this House that the Conservative governments up until 1985 only caused \$25 billion of the public debt in this province. They caused almost \$50 billion worth of public debt, and I think she ought to be reminded of that as well. Thank you very much.

Mrs Boyd: I'm pleased to rise and compliment my colleague the member for Fort York on his very clear disagreement with this bill and the reasons for it.

It is very disappointing, but it is only to be expected from this government, that the member for Fort York was hassled throughout by another member not in his seat, and constantly in this House we see efforts like that of the member for Mississauga South to interrupt other members when they are exercising their rights as members to speak against this government's policies.

I would say that this government has shown its arrogance in many ways increasingly over the past few days, the arrogance of the kinds of comments that are made about a speaker like the member for Fort York, trying to interrupt him in his exercise of his rights as a member in this place, and the effort of the member for Mississauga South to provide the member for Kingston and The Islands tit for tat because he interrupted her at another time is very childish.

This is an issue that's very important. This is a government that has taken away 40% of the funding available to municipalities and now they are taking away one of the few tools municipalities had to make up for some of that difference. They say they are doing it because it is going to cost people who want to buy homes less money. I'll believe that when the day comes. I said that to the representatives of the Urban Development Institute. It will be indeed a frosty Friday in this province before we see those house prices go down because of this bill.

1700

Mr O'Toole: It's a pleasure to rise to participate briefly in Bill 98, the Development Charges Act, and to respond to the member for Fort York and some of his comments. I'll only be commenting on those parts specific to Bill 98.

The member should know full well that prior to the development charges, we had lot levies. You'd be aware of that. You had some time in local government, I believe, and you realize that the Liberal government, in about 1988, set about trying to have some equity in the whole system of development in Ontario. The good member for Kingston and The Islands would know that as well.

That's a bit of the history, and it was never really fully accepted. It was never a fully accepted, balanced quantum that was used across Ontario, and the quantum does vary from municipality to municipality. I think everyone here would agree that this had to be examined, and some quantum included such things as fairly high profile cultural centres, tourism centres and things that weren't particularly specific — or at least they were upgrading the service level for their constituents.

I admit as well there were some fairly developed quantum. I know in Durham and in Northumberland county next to me, their development charge is about half. So development is going where the development charge is lower.

The member talked at some length about Bill 163, their planning act. We know what's happened to that. There was great outrage to that across the province and that's been addressed. He also talked about Bill 103, and we know how that's been handled.

I would prefer he stuck to the discussion at hand, and I would put to him that we've listened to UDI and refuted most of that. AMO and ROMA: We've made changes. He recognizes this isn't the first draft.

I'm looking forward to some really substantial comments by the member for Middlesex, who is a professional planner. I look forward to his comments.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Brantford will take his own seat.

The member for Fort York has two minutes to respond.

Mr Marchese: I thank the members for Mississauga South, Kingston and The Islands, London Centre and Durham East.

Just for clarity purposes, it is true that the member for Mississauga South did not interfere with what I was saying or intervene. There were some other members who cheerfully tried to do that, vociferously, and that's okay. It's part of what we do around here, but sometimes it gets out of hand, like the member for London Centre has said, and that's a bit of a problem.

But first of all, to the member for Mississauga South, I have nothing but respect for Hazel McCallion, and I spoke in those terms. So you took a moment to make it appear as if I didn't. I did speak highly of her, and I will agree with you that she's a young general indeed, to use your terms.

When you talk about welfare, you talk about how many jobs you created, what you're creating is a lot of homelessness. There are a lot of people on the streets who no longer have the benefits of being able to have a decent form of living that they were accustomed to. Many people have been shut out and they're out in the cold and many of them are homeless.

To the member for Durham East, I want to say that he speaks about equity and wanting to achieve equity because development charges vary from one jurisdiction to the other. I don't know why we want to achieve equity. If one municipality is charging a different developmental charge rate, what's wrong with that? Each community needs to establish its own needs. We are not all equal across the province; we are not all equally wealthy. So if some community charges a different rate, in my view, that flexibility is a requirement. What you've done is you've taken an important tool away from municipalities. We believe it's wrong. You've only listened to people like your friends, like the Urban Development Institute, and that is all. You didn't listen to people like Hazel McCallion.

Mr Bruce Smith (Middlesex): It's certainly a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak briefly on the bill this afternoon and as well to follow my friend and colleague from Fort York, who I've had the pleasure of working

with a little bit in committee. I'm always impressed with his flamboyance, albeit we do find ourselves with a difference of opinion on many occasions, but I certainly do appreciate his presentation and his thoughts today.

First of all, I'm pleased to have the parliamentary assistant, Mr Hardeman, the member for Oxford, sitting beside me because a great deal of consultation has taken place with respect to this particular bill, and in fact as one of the government members who participated in Bill 20, the debate actually extended back to that period of time when we started to talk about reforms to development charges in this province. I think it's important to realize that consultation, the discussion around the bill, has been ongoing since that point in time. I know he has worked very hard over the last short while to continue that debate with municipal partners in the development industry in order that we find the appropriate balance with respect to the outcomes of this bill.

From my own perspective, I think it's important to realize that in 1989 when the Development Charges Act was introduced, it was introduced for well-intentioned reasons. It was certainly necessary in terms of establishing some very formalized structures for municipalities to recover costs associated with services and growth and development in their communities. From my own experience, prior to 1989 there was a great deal of inconsistency in practice and in some cases, not all cases, a degree of abuse in terms of the application of what we used to call lot levies, or formerly impost fees. Certainly the intended legislation in 1989 was very well-intentioned and very necessary, given the practices that were occurring throughout the province from municipality to municipality. At that time we were looking for opportunities to increase accountability, to ensure that growth was paying for growth in these communities and at the same time providing a mechanism whereby roads, sewers and recreational facilities as well as parks and libraries would be paid for.

Somehow over the past six or seven years those objectives have been somewhat compromised and there's been a need to revisit those objectives. The outcome of that compromise has been an impact on affordability, an impact on growth opportunities in this province, as well as those costs which inhibit opportunities for commercial and industrial growth and job creation opportunities. From that perspective, I think we have to move forward positively to find the balance that I mentioned earlier.

Given those concerns, we initiated a fundamental review that commenced in November 1995. Essentially we wanted to revisit the system whereby we would seek to establish a fair system for the financing of new infrastructure, focus on opportunities to reduce the costs of development and the cost of construction of new homes in this province. We also wanted to create an environment that would lead to positive industrial-commercial expansion in all our communities across the province. Most important, the key issue has to be an element of fairness within the system and, equally important, a system that provides some balance between the interests of the municipal sector and the development industry in Ontario. That balance is critically important.

I think it's important to recognize that there have been some success stories. My colleague from Fort York went on at great length about the comments of the deputy mayor of the city of London. It's important to realize that the city of London has a very distinct interest in this because it, in essence, has had special legislation in place to address servicing costs since about the early 1970s. In fact, if my memory recalls correctly, London really has not paid for the installation of any new sewer since the early 1970s; any sewer that is associated with growth, that is. That system has been in place, and I understand the deputy mayor's concern from the perspective that he doesn't want to see that system compromised by new legislation that's being presented today. Those are fair criticisms that I know the parliamentary assistant will be addressing, or will hope to address and take into consideration as we move forward with this bill.

At the same time, in the London community a very positive relationship was established and maintained throughout that period of time, where the development industry was always at the table from the beginning and that led to some positive conclusions that were mutually beneficial to both the industry and the municipality. Again, it's my recollection that no appeal was ever filed, either in 1991 or 1995, against the development charges bylaw in the city of London, and by and large that was due to the cooperative efforts that were advanced by both industry and the municipal representatives in the city of London. Unfortunately, this hasn't been the norm across the province. The London example hasn't been the norm, and for that reason we have to look at other opportunities to provide the balance which I spoke of earlier.

710

Recognizing those successes which I spoke of, I hope we can move forward and set aside some of the concerns that some of the municipal partners have with respect to the proposals outlined in this bill. Those proposals deal with four main components, the first of which involves the reduction in the scope of services that would be eligible to be levied against in terms of a development charge. In doing so we would eliminate the ability of a municipality to charge for facilities such as city halls, museums, theatres, hospitals, tourism facilities and other related facilities that the minister may deem important. I can speak from some experience, as a person who has written development charges bylaws and conducted background studies, that there is a tendency when you're writing those reports and those bylaws to capture as much as you possibly can under the umbrella of the approved legislation of the day. It's not done maliciously by any means, but certainly from the municipal perspective, I think it's important to recognize that from time to time that occurs.

The second key element to all of this is the aspect of proposing increased municipal accountability and cost-effectiveness. This is really a fundamental component of the bill, and from my point of view and the city of London's point of view, so to speak, the cornerstone of some of the discussion and disappointment in some areas with respect to what's being proposed, and perhaps concern. I think, by and large, given the hard work of my colleague from Oxford, in many cases those concerns

have been set aside, albeit I know they will not be a 100% comfort level with the total outcomes, the outcomes that are anticipated from this bill.

As part of this cornerstone, we're asking that municipalities help pay for components of facility development. In particular, it would represent about 10% on conventional services such as water, sewer and roads, and about 30% on all other eligible services.

The third key element is that municipalities carry out background studies, examining the long-term cost of new servicing requirements being considered for funding through the development charges. By and large, this is a continuation of what we have, but it places greater onus on municipal partners and others to examine thoroughly the impact of decisions around future servicing opportunities. There is also a need, a very necessary need, to calculate actual benefit costs to new residents.

The fourth key element that's contained in the bill is a focus on the commitment to generate industrial growth. Under the terms of the proposed act, any industrial expansion of up to 50% of existing gross floor area would be exempt. Certainly in many communities and in larger urbanized communities, I recognize this is a significant issue, but it's also important to realize that in many small communities across this province industrial-commercial uses in many cases are already exempt by virtue of choice of that particular municipality.

In addition to those four key components of the bill, I wanted to emphasize one other item. I want to emphasize the fact that this component is in no way related to the bill. It's something I hope the parliamentary assistant will consider, as a member from Oxford and a member who represents many small local communities.

I know many communities in my area have asked for consideration or opportunity for the minister to establish minimum levies that would be applied across the board with respect to residential development. Those are the same communities that really do not have the financial wherewithal either to undertake a background study or, in the event they do undertake a background study, have the ability to recover any costs associated with it over the longer period.

Having said that, that would represent some community whereby anywhere from one to six to 10 new lots may be created within a particular year. It's a very small component but one that I know many townships, particularly in Middlesex, have inquired about, opportunities whereby that wherewithal isn't there; not that there isn't interest, but certainly they would like to have the opportunity to provide some across-the-board levy, and that levy, in my mind, would have to be established through some indication from the minister himself.

Again, I would only emphasize that there should be no confusion as to that position. It's not contained in this bill, but something I would hope that at some point the ministry may consider in terms of the deliberations of this particular act.

Certainly the development charges from my perspective will still continue to help municipalities fund roads, water facilities, sewers etc. Development charges will no longer fund facilities such as museums, art centres and new city halls. Residents of the entire community can

decide over time whether they can afford these facilities or whether they want to build them. A contribution from municipalities towards the cost of facilities they believe are necessary for new development will encourage more accountability to the taxpayer in both new and existing neighbourhoods.

Community growth must be financed in a way that is fair to all, and I believe this bill is an important first step to finding that fairness. The new Development Charges Act is more balanced and will give assurances to municipalities that key services — I emphasize “key services” — and infrastructure needed for growth will still be funded through development charges rather than through increased taxes for residents in existing neighbourhoods.

As I mentioned earlier, we have consulted extensively on the revisions to this act. Earlier this week I had the representatives of the London development industry in my office to talk about some of the issues that remain outstanding from their perspective, and similar discussions are ongoing with municipal representatives in Middlesex and London, with the expectation that those comments will be given to the parliamentary assistant, and due consideration will be given to their comments and concerns.

I think it comes as no surprise that development needs to be encouraged responsibly. It has the opportunity to create jobs and economic vitality in our various communities across the province. It represents potential for good in all of this province.

Our government is clearly doing what it can to make housing more affordable to new home buyers. The new development charges process is streamlined, is cutting red tape and, in my opinion, reducing costs for both municipalities and the development industry.

To conclude, I've been very pleased with the ongoing discussions we've had with municipal sector partners. I think it's been very positive. The minister's establishment of a steering committee and Mr Hardeman's involvement in that committee has led to some very constructive observations and conclusions of where we need to take this bill over the next short while. As well, as the bill moves to public hearings, we have further opportunity to receive input from various communities.

Given the experiences, the leadership that has been demonstrated in the city of London with respect to development charges and the application of a system with respect to growth and servicing opportunities, I would hope the hearings might stop in the city of London whereby the committee may gain access to some of that experience and apply that experience to this particular bill.

It was my pleasure to have a few minutes to speak on this and I appreciate the opportunity to provide some comments, both from a practical perspective and from the perspective of a government member who's involved with this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Margaret Marland): Questions and comments?

Mr Gerretsen: I'm quite sure that I will not be interrupted this time.

I would just like to say first of all that the member left the impression, when he said some municipalities are exempt, that municipalities have to have development

charges. That is not the case. Municipalities can choose whether they want to implement the Development Charges Act, or there are many municipalities, like my own, that don't have them at all. It is when they implement or want to use the Development Charges Act that this government, through this act, wants to impose restrictions on what municipalities can charge for. That is wrong. If you are in a true partnership with municipalities, why don't you allow the municipalities to work that out with the developers themselves?

The second point I want to make is that I've heard so often now in this House, on at least three or four occasions, from the government members that there are many museums, city halls or theatres being funded through development charges. I would like them to tell me of just one incident where actually a theatre or a museum was funded through development charges.

He talks about consultation and how they've talked to the development industry. Well, I would invite him, together with anyone else who's interested, to come to Oakville on March 24 where undoubtedly we will hear from Hazel McCallion, the mayor of Mississauga who we've talked about so much this afternoon, and hear her views of development charges. She certainly doesn't want to make any changes, as does AMO, an organization that represents 700 to 800 municipalities in this province. They basically believe in the partnership notion, whereby municipalities themselves will determine with the development industry what is appropriate in their individual, particular case.

1720

I strongly urge the member for Middlesex to take those matters into account and to vote against this bill on second reading.

Mrs Boyd: It's a pleasure to comment on the speech from my neighbour the member for Middlesex. I think the content of his speech and the seriousness with which he regards the issues that have been raised by those who are against this bill speaks very much to the kind of member he is. Unlike many of his colleagues in the governing party, this is a member who doesn't mind admitting that there is controversy about a bill and is very clear about his responsibility as a member in this place to hear those comments and to try to do something to create an atmosphere in which local municipalities can continue to do business with the provincial government. That is a great relief as opposed to the arrogance and the lack of consultation that characterizes many of the other interactions between this government and the municipalities.

While I disagree with the conclusion the member for Middlesex has made, that in fact this can all be worked out as the committee goes around, I certainly take very seriously his comment that the committee will listen to the representations of those, like his own city of London, who have been very opposed to the imposition of the limitations within this bill. I trust we will see a different attitude towards possible changes in this bill than we have seen today with the committee ramming through Bill 103 as is, despite the promises of the members of the government cabinet and caucus that there would be substantial amendments.

It is really important that people in the governing party look at the way in which it is possible to deal with controversy in a respectful and knowledgeable way, as the member for Middlesex has done.

Mr O'Toole: It's a pleasure to respond to the member for Middlesex. I just want to compliment him on his very professional and very polite presentation to those in attendance and those perhaps viewing. I think he did clarify a couple of the improvements or enhancements with Bill 98 to make it more clear what is a permissible charge in developing the quantum. As a professional planner, I certainly respect his views. I know he's competent and capable of listening to those who are petitioning all of the members, I'm certain, on both sides of the House to make the right decision to have a fair — after all, the purchaser of the house actually pays the development charge. We must keep in mind that the young families that are purchasing new homes — we've got to do something to control the price of homes. We have to put the pressure on the development industry to pass on these savings to the home buyer. I'm sincere in that commitment, and I believe the member for Middlesex is as well.

I can attest that not only the member for Middlesex but indeed the member for Oxford, the PA to the minister, has consulted widely. I know just how much time, effort and work he has put into it, and with his municipal background, I again have a great deal of respect that they're, with integrity, out there listening to the people who are appealing to them to come up with a fair piece of legislation.

I also look forward to the public hearings. I know we will hear from many of the mayors, regional chairs and municipally elected people as well as planners, and certainly we'll hear from the development industry. We'll hear from both sides of the equation. But at the end of the day, we have to remember that the customer, the person purchasing the house, specifically new, young home buyers — they're the ones I've always felt badly for. When first elected, lot levies in my area were around \$10,000; now they're around \$20,000. It's not fair. We have to make sure that we're passing on to the home buyer what's fair and what's a fair level of service.

The Acting Speaker: Further questions and comments?

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You would know, as the member for Mississauga South, the concern that the mayor of Mississauga, your good friend and mine Hazel McCallion, has for this piece of legislation. I know that it's not one simply to complain for the sake of complaining. She wants to know that legislation is not going to hurt her municipality. So I'm with Hazel on this one, I may use that name, because she's kind of a friend to all of us. I'm with Hazel on this one. I think she's absolutely right. She recognizes, as so many municipal representatives do, and my friend the member for Mississauga South was on council as well and understood very well, how important it is that municipalities have the opportunity, where necessary, to have impost charges, that is, to meet the costs of new services that

result from new people moving in and new development taking place within a community.

What you're doing is slashing the funding to the municipalities drastically. They're having to look to find new sources of funding. They've always, at least in recent years, had the impost fees which they felt were reasonable, but the very time you're downloading responsibility on to them and additional costs you're taking away one of their opportunities to have some revenue coming into their coffers. This is like going back to the hula hoop days, in my view. The Premier made reference to hula hoops the other day. The Premier said the other day about hula hoops that they had to close the factory down when they quit making hula hoops because they went out of style and he said the same thing for nurses. He said they were like those who made hula hoops. I guess health care is going out of style.

The reason I mention that is because municipalities are going to have to pick up some new health care costs, so don't hit these municipalities again. I know municipal councillors are very concerned about this. They hope you'll withdraw this bill.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Middlesex has two minutes to respond.

Mr Smith: Thank you for the comments from the members for Kingston and The Islands, Durham East, St Catharines, and particularly the kind remarks from the member for London Centre.

Throughout my comments I was attempting to emphasize the need to provide some balance between those interests identified in the development industry and the interests identified in municipalities. I certainly believe in the constructive consultation that has been ongoing because I've been a part of that process.

Too often I think the government has been criticized for lack of consultation, but I can assure you and the people of Middlesex and London that a considerable amount of effort on behalf of the parliamentary assistant and others has been exhausted in trying to find a conclusion to the differences of opinion on this particular bill and finding a positive conclusion to the concerns that both municipal and development industry representatives have. I think it's important to emphasize as well that the consultation was not necessarily unique by any means, but involved municipal officials from the outset, and at one point in time included the professional staff of various large urbanized communities in this area in terms of their input on the details of this particular bill.

I know the member for Kingston and The Islands brings a great deal of municipal experience to this House, experience which I certainly respect. I know as well, given the Kingston experience, that the process utilized there is not necessarily the same as that contemplated in other communities. But by and large there is a need to find that balance in those communities where perhaps excesses have been experienced, and at the same time not to compromise those communities where success stories exist with respect to this particular issue. Again I thank all members for their particular comments and for the opportunity to speak on the bill.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I'm pleased to join the debate and I might say I too appreciate the comments of the member for Middlesex — thoughtful and helpful.

What we're dealing with here is an assessment of how we will pay for essential services in our new communities. The government has made a decision that services that previously were paid for as part of the cost of building a home — the developer put them into the cost of building the home — the government has decided it's going to shift a significant portion of that and put it on the existing residential property taxpayer. That's a decision the government has made, and I gather that the government has decided perhaps as much as \$100 million. I gather the plan here is that they should reduce development charges by perhaps \$2,000 or \$3,000 a unit. That's about \$100 million that will be put on the residential property taxpayer. Some members may say: "That's what I want to do. I want the existing residential property taxpayers in a community to pay more money for services in the new subdivisions." That's what the bill's all about. That's the judgement this government has made.

1730

Mr Bradley: That's the way it was back in the days of hula hoops.

Mr Phillips: The way it was back in the days of the hula hoop.

I would say to my colleagues from Durham that my daughter and her husband live in Durham and they will be interested to hear that it is the plan of the government to shift more taxes on to their existing home to pay for the services in the new subdivisions. That's the judgement you've decided to make, and that's a judgement that of course you will defend at the election.

I think we need to remember, first, our judgement is that \$100 million in new residential property tax charges that used to be paid for by the developer, and I suppose a portion of it by the person buying the new home, the government has said: "No, no. We're going to move that over to the existing residential property taxpayer." So all of those people in Mississauga, in Durham, in York and around the province who live in communities where you see a subdivision being built and houses going up will realize that this bill, once passed, will mean you're going to pick up on your property taxes expenses that previously were paid for by that development going in. That's the decision the government has made.

I would also say that we cannot judge in isolation the bill that does this, Bill 98, which moves charges away from the development and on to the existing property taxpayer, without looking at the other things that are being loaded now on to property taxpayers.

We know the government's intention to move, and I personally find this — "obscene" is perhaps strong language, but I'll use it. I find it obscene that we are moving seniors' services, services for our seniors, on to the property taxpayer. We're moving 100% of our social housing costs off the province and on to the municipal property taxpayer, and well over half of social housing in this province is for our seniors. The government has decided they are going to do that.

The government has decided they are going to move long-term care — that's all our services for our senior community, either in our residential units, our nursing homes and our homes for the aged or our services in their home — on to the property taxpayer. They are moving ambulance services on to the property taxpayer, moving social assistance, and many of our seniors rely on social assistance, obviously, and many of our young people rely on it.

The bill we're dealing with compounds that problem. It compounds that problem because the government will acknowledge, I'm sure, that it is still going to spend. That money has to be spent to build the sewers and the roads and the libraries and the firehalls. That money has to be spent. It used to be covered by the developer. Now it's going to be covered partially by the developer and partially by the residential property taxpayer.

So the government has made that decision, but I would just say to the people of Ontario that at the same time as they've made that decision, they've made the decision to download a dramatic amount of cost on to the property taxpayer, and they're also moving on revisions to the property tax.

We dealt yesterday, as you know, Madam Speaker, with Bill 106, which is part of the package of bills going through the Legislature now, and that is the property tax change bill. That bill adds, in our judgement, substantially more cost on to the residential property taxpayer. Why? Because the bill says they are going to eliminate something called the business occupancy tax for municipalities. They can no longer charge that. That's gone. That was \$1.6 billion of revenue for municipalities, 11% of the revenue for municipalities, gone, completely gone. The province just said to the business community, "We're your friend; we're getting rid of this," but it was a gift that was owned by the municipalities given away by the province, and the municipalities now have to make it up. There is zero doubt that the municipalities have got to recoup that money, the \$1.6 billion, 11% of their total revenue, and some of that is going to be, without doubt — the municipalities have said this — added on to the residential property taxpayer.

In addition to that, the property tax bill, which has now passed second reading and will be out for public hearings the weeks of April 7 and 14, there are other elements in that bill that are pushing taxes on to the residential property taxpayer, by design. When the government talked about the bill yesterday, they said it is designed to move taxes on to the residential property taxpayer.

The reason I raise all of that is that municipalities cannot deal with this bill as simply a bill in isolation designed to theoretically reduce the price of housing. I say theoretically because while it may reduce the cost for a developer by \$2,000 or \$3,000, there is zero guarantee that that ends up being passed on to the people buying the homes. As a matter of fact, I think most developers will tell you that the price of their housing is determined by the marketplace, what resales are going for in the area, because that's the choice people have. I can buy a brand-new home, and I don't think there's anybody who goes out and looks just at new homes. They go and look at existing homes and they go and look at new homes. So that's what determines the price.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: This is a very important comment on this bill, and we do not have a quorum.

The Acting Speaker: Is there a quorum present?

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

Mr Phillips: As I was saying, there is no guarantee at all that this will result in savings to new home buyers. We hope it might, but there's no guarantee of it. As a matter of fact, as I was saying earlier, I think the price of a home is more determined by the resale value of existing homes in the area.

So here's what the risk of all of this is. Municipalities like Mississauga that rely on these charges rely on these charges to allow development to go ahead. Mississauga has had great growth, but it has been able to do it because as it expanded, it was able to find the funds from the developers to fund the expansion. Here's what's going to happen now. The municipalities are going to have to find a significant part of the cost off the residential property taxpayer. That's a tough choice that you are putting in front of municipal councillors: Build these sewers, these roads, these firehalls, all these new services, build them, add costs, and that cost has to be put on to the existing residential property tax base.

I can imagine there will be some debates in municipalities that say, "I'm not sure where we're going to be able to get the money," so it is the residential property taxpayers who are going to pick it up. I believe one could argue, with 50,000 units being built in Ontario and if it's just \$2,000-a-unit-reduced development, that's \$100 million that has to be found by the municipalities on the rest of their tax base.

1740

You then add on top of that the downloading, and we would love, by the way, to have some public hearings on the downloading. Our caucus just completed a tour of the province. We went to 10 communities. We've talked to I think 200 different community leaders all over the province on this downloading because this is part of the package. I can tell you there wasn't one municipal leader, not one, who didn't tell us that this is a dumb idea.

Here's what Mr Cooke, the regional chair of Hamilton-Wentworth, said, and Mr Cooke is one of the most respected municipal leaders. He's a regional chair. He was handpicked by Premier Harris to sit on the Who Does What committee, handpicked, and he said:

"In its present form, the disentanglement process is fundamentally flawed. It will destabilize the financial viability, especially of bigger urban regions, and, over the long haul, my fear is, again, we will divide the province into a series of communities, some of which have and some of which have not."

Mr Bradley: Terry is a Conservative.

Mr Phillips: My colleague says he's a Conservative. I don't know what his political stripe is. It doesn't matter to me. He's just a well-respected individual who said that.

We talked to 200 different people. David Crombie himself, who headed up the panel, and the public should be aware: Premier Harris said to David Crombie, a former federal Conservative cabinet minister, a well-regarded individual, and 14 other handpicked people from around the province, "Take a look at this whole area of the relationship between the province and municipalities." David Crombie did that with the panel.

What did they recommend? They said, "We strongly oppose what you're doing and we unanimously recommend that you not proceed to download social assistance, health, long-term care, social housing on to property tax." Believe me, it is a big mistake, and I'm sure the member for Oxford talks often with municipal leaders around the province and is hearing the same thing.

They are begging you to reconsider that decision, and groups as diverse — I'm a Toronto member and our three Toronto dailies editorially, all three of them, have said this is a huge mistake. The Globe and Mail — and this is very strong language for any editorial page — calls it a disaster. The Toronto Star in the last two days has been running a series of editorials begging the government to reconsider its decision to offload, download, dump these essential social services.

I repeat, we went across the province. The headline of the report is: The Mike Harris Plan... "Fundamentally Flawed." That's Mr Cooke's comment. The reason it's important is that you are putting this development charges bill, Bill 98, into that environment where you can just imagine that first, for many of our growing communities, if it is \$2,000 a unit it is \$100 million a year of offloading, downloading in this case from the developers on to the property taxpayers; you add that on top of this downloading along with the property tax reform. I would just say to all of us, I am very disappointed that we do not have from the cabinet impact studies on what's going to happen on the property tax reform.

Mr Bradley: They refused to give them out.

Mr Phillips: My colleague says they refused to give them out. As a matter of fact they did refuse to give them out. They were requested under freedom of information, which is an act we have here in the province that tries to get information from the government. The member for Carleton, the cabinet minister, I think was a strong advocate of this in opposition. I admired him for that. He was a strong advocate for freedom of information.

In this case I would say to all of us, we're making a big mistake in passing the property tax bill and having no idea of what its impact is going to be. I don't mean to be unfair to the government deliberately, but it's not unlike several other bills we have before us. I will say to all of us, I don't think we've got from the cabinet the information we need to assess —

Interjection.

Mr Phillips: I appreciate that, but when you think of the combination of these things that will hit our municipalities a year from now —

Mrs Boyd: You're going to wear it.

Mr Phillips: As my colleague says, you're going to wear it. She knows well, having been in government, that you do wear it.

The magic in government and the magic for all of us is to — we're now at the concept stage on these bills, which is that the bill is before us. What all of us have to try and do is to visualize what it's going to mean when it's implemented. How is it going to impact on people? This is the time when you can change. This is the time when you can head off problems. This is the time when you can get it right. The next time you'll see these things is about a year from now and, in my opinion, a lot of this isn't right.

The reason I raise it all around the development bill is that what our municipalities are seeing is a combination of things: the downloading here in Metropolitan Toronto, the mega-bill, the amalgamation, the property tax reform bill, the education bill, and this development charges hit. When all of those things come together, that is a recipe for quite an explosive brew.

As you recall, we had a resolution calling for the cabinet to release the information it used to make its decision on these things, and the back bench, for whatever reason, voted against it. The Conservative members voted against releasing that. I think you may live to regret that.

Mr Bradley: Is that in Hansard? I don't believe that.

Mr Phillips: My colleague says, "Is that in Hansard?" Yes, it is in Hansard. As you remember, it was a resolution proposed by us to try and get the totality of these bills implemented. As a matter of fact, I would say that in our travels around the province, in addition to the municipalities saying to us — and by the way, there was not a municipality we went to that didn't say this dumping is going to mean property tax increases of at least 10%, and that's after the distribution of the revenue funds the government says it's going to provide. Remember this: the revenue funds the government is providing are going to be, in the end, about \$330 million. You're adding a minimum of \$1.3 billion and you're providing about \$330 million of extra funds. So there's no question, in municipality after municipality, they told us a 10% average increase in property tax was minimal. I repeat, I don't know why the government backbench members haven't been demanding that the government cabinet release that kind of information to them.

Mr Bradley: Wait till they hear about this in Manotick.

Mr Phillips: My colleague says, "Wait till they hear about this." My concern is that I think a lot of these bills have been slapped together in quite an ad hoc fashion.

Mrs Boyd: And in isolation.

Mr Phillips: "And in isolation," my colleague says. I think that's probably true. No one has looked at this whole package, it looks like: the education package, the property tax package, the development charges package, all of this dumping stuff. No one's looked at this thing in totality, and when it finally hits, as I said earlier, it is an explosive brew.

1750

If all of this activity by the government was actually working and if actually things in the health sector were getting better, and in our education sector and our job prospects were getting better, I think you can —

Hon Mr Saunderson: They are.

Mr Phillips: The member said they are getting better on the job prospects. I will say this: In 1996 there were 27,000 more people out of work in Ontario than there were in 1995. When Mike Harris became Premier, there were 499,000 people out of work. What's happened now? There are 30,000 more people out of work today than there were when Mike Harris became Premier. We have lost 37,000 jobs in Ontario in the last five months. It is incredible. I ignore one-month or two-month numbers, but in five months, 37,000 fewer jobs.

The employment numbers come out tomorrow and I suspect we should see a pretty good uptake in employment, probably 15,000 jobs or something like that, but it still will mean, over a six-month period, we actually will have 20,000 or 25,000 fewer jobs in Ontario. Quite extraordinary.

Hon Mr Saunderson: That's not right.

Mr Phillips: You see, this is the problem. The Minister of Economic Development says it's not right. I challenge you to prove it wrong. These are your numbers. These are your numbers released by the finance ministry. This is the problem. If the Minister of Economic Development doesn't know this, we're in big trouble. Mr Saunderson, the Minister of Economic Development, says it's not true. Here's the headline right here: "Ontario Loses 7,000 Jobs in January." Here are the numbers: "In January 1997, the Ontario youth unemployment rate was 18.6%, up 2.3 percentage points from a year ago." On the back here, 37,000 fewer jobs than five months ago.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr Phillips: I'm just saying, nothing could be more stark in the problem than the Minister of Economic Development not being aware that Ontario has lost 37,000 jobs in the last five months, and then having the nerve to say it's not right, because he produced the figures; these are the Ministry of Finance figures, and to say that they're not right.

I would just say this. I will repeat this and then I'll ask Mr Saunderson to give me a memo that contradicts it. I will say that Ontario has lost 37,000 jobs in the past five months. I will take out —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): You can't bet.

Mr Phillips: You can't bet \$5?

Ms Lankin: Not in the Legislature.

Mr Phillips: Not in the Legislature. Well, I'll bet a Diet Coke —

The Acting Speaker: I'll ask the member for Scarborough-Agincourt to address your comments to the Chair, please.

Mr Phillips: Here is the tragedy, and perhaps it makes the point. I was saying that in my opinion I don't think the cabinet has put this thing together, and then the Minister of Economic Development says that they haven't lost 37,000 jobs, when the Minister of Finance publishes the numbers. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Economic Development can't be talking, or he can't be getting the information, or he doesn't know the numbers.

I would just say to you, go to your office and prove that we haven't lost 37,000 jobs. I'm right, because these are your own numbers. They're not my numbers, they're

your numbers, and if you don't understand we've lost 37,000 jobs and it is your responsibility, then you've got a big problem because you've got your head in the sand and you don't know what you're talking about.

Here is the problem: The government itself doesn't understand there is a problem. The government itself doesn't understand that it has lost 37,000 jobs. The government doesn't understand that Ontario lost 7,000 jobs in January, and I might add the rest of the country has gained 72,000 jobs.

If you don't even know there's a problem, you'll never solve it. This is what discourages me about the Premier: He says there isn't a problem. I say to the unemployed people in the province of Ontario, there is a problem; we understand there's a problem; they don't understand there's a problem. It's particularly crucial among our young people.

Mr Ron Johnson: It's getting better.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Brantford.

Mr Phillips: I will repeat the challenge, and I'll look very much forward, Mr Saunderson, to you convincing anybody that we have not lost 37,000 jobs in Ontario.

I will just also say that you ran on a platform, Mr Saunderson. You made the big promise. You said, "This plan will create more than 725,000 new jobs over the next five years." You made that promise.

Hon Mr Saunderson: Yes, we are and we will.

Mr Phillips: Here we are now. Now we're 19 months into your regime. On that promise, you should have had 228,000 jobs; 97,000 jobs. It ain't working. I am particularly concerned about the people, for example, on social assistance. I remember you said: "Just go out and get a job. That's your problem. Go get a job." It's not that easy, when by your own admission there are 30,000 more people out of work now than when you took office.

Hon Mr Saunderson: No.

Mr Phillips: You see, the minister says "No". Again, I challenge you, Minister. Mr Saunderson is shaking his head. Do you not look at these numbers? Do you have no idea about these numbers? Do you not realize these are the Minister of Finance's numbers? I would think this should be something that is first and foremost on your job. You're the Minister of Economic Development and you don't even know the numbers. This is very embarrassing, Minister, that by your own numbers 30,000 more people are out of work than the day you took office.

Hon Mr Saunderson: How about the population increase?

The Acting Speaker: I ask the minister not to interject.

Mr Phillips: How about the population increase? There are more people out of work, you're admitting, but the population has grown. Here is the problem we run into —

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Brantford is not in his seat and interjections are out of order.

Mr Phillips: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't mean to get myself exercised like this, but the Minister of Economic Development, whose prime job should be to encourage job creation — we have a real problem — nobody's told him. He doesn't know. Nobody's told him

there are 30,000 more people out of work now than when he came into office. Nobody's told him that youth unemployment is 2.3 percentage points higher now than it was a year ago. Nobody's told him we've lost 37,000 jobs.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Member for Fort York, I can still see you and you're out of order.

Mr Phillips: The reason we got into this is that to try and deal with the one bill in isolation, as municipalities are going to find the downloading, I can guarantee you, across the province — and you must all have heard from your mayors. Now I'm really concerned because Mr Saunderson, the Minister of Economic Development, has been kept in the dark. Nobody in his ministry has told him he's got a big problem. I guess they don't want to worry him. But 30,000 more people out of work? I guess it's just, "Don't worry, Minister. Yes, Minister, everything's fine," but I would have thought that would be the first thing they do.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member's time has expired. Questions and comments?

1800

Mr Marchese: Just to agree with much of what has already been said by the member who has just spoken, we have a number of problems and the problem is the following: You're about to reduce the development charges and what that will do is give money to the developer. It will not give a cent to the homeowner. What it will do is increase property taxes for people who are living in that area providing the necessary services that are required by that community. That's what you are about to do.

You have taken an essential tool away from municipalities, the only tool they had to raise some money. You've whacked them with so many cuts over the last two years, and then you take the only tool left where they could raise some money to provide essential services. And you are about to tell them that's fair? And you are about to tell these communities that we'll have increased jobs? This measure is not for one moment going to help out with the economy, will not for one moment help one iota to create one new house. What's creating housing at this time is that interest rates are very low and there has been a pent-up demand. By eliminating development charges you will not be creating more housing as a result. There will be no more jobs.

You've got a serious problem on your hands in terms of employment and this is not what's going to create more employment in Ontario. What this will do is give more money to developers and less money that should indeed go to homeowners, but this plan is not that one. You're just helping your rich developer friends with this, and I agree with the comments Mr Phillips made in this regard.

Mr Baird: I enjoyed the remarks by my colleague the member for Scarborough-Agincourt. He's certainly an honourable member. I wish he had talked more about this bill. He talked about job creation. This bill is all about job creation, all about trying to create jobs in Ontario, a very important piece of that job creation agenda.

He talked about the 725,000 jobs we want to create in the province. We want to turn the ship around and get it going in the right direction, and this bill is a key part of that in order to create jobs.

Mr Bradley: I thought this was an excellent speech by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt who is so knowledgeable in this field. I was surprised he didn't mention, because there is going to be development taking place on the Niagara Escarpment, the fact that the Premier has taken from Mr Norm Sterling, the Minister of Environment and Energy, responsibility for the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Mr Sterling, as we know, is a long-time advocate for the preservation and protection of the Niagara Escarpment. I can't for the life of me understand why the Premier would take that responsibility away from a person who has clearly demonstrated, not just by his word but by his action, support for preserving the escarpment.

I know there's going to be development take place. We're going to see the Escarpment Hilton, the Escarpment Holiday Inn, the Escarpment Howard Johnson's. We're going to see severances like you've never seen before on the escarpment. We're going to see gravel pits and more quarrying, maybe even garbage dumps, because now it's in the hands of the Ministry of Natural Resources, a ministry which has never had a history of protecting the environment over the years.

I felt much more comfortable, as I'm sure my good friend the member for Mississauga South, and I might add an excellent environment critic for the Conservative Party when she was on this side of the House — she must be completely beside herself that we are no longer seeing the Ministry of Environment in charge of the Niagara Escarpment Commission. We're going to see development taking place. That's how it relates to development charges.

I know my friend the member for Scarborough-Agincourt didn't have time to mention this. I hope the Premier reconsiders. I hope he gives this responsibility back to my friend Norm Sterling who I know will stand up for the escarpment.

The Acting Speaker: Further questions and comments? The member for Scarborough-Agincourt has two minutes to respond.

Mr Phillips: Just to wrap up the debate on Bill 98, I think the highlights are that without any doubt we are adding somewhere around \$100 million a year on to the existing property taxpayer. That's a decision the government has decided to make, and I guess I understand it. I don't have to agree with it. I don't agree with it, because the existing residential property taxpayers, particularly in growth areas, are going to face an enormous extra cost.

Mr Bradley: Many of them are seniors.

Mr Phillips: Many seniors, as my colleague said.

You can imagine, if you're on the council of one of those municipalities such as Mississauga, the conflict you're going to be in now. You approve new development and your existing taxpayers have to pay tens of millions of dollars in extra annual charges at the same time as they are going to be paying residential property taxes for long-term care — our seniors now are going to be dependent on the residential property taxpayer — social

housing, and we must always remind ourselves a majority in social housing in Ontario are seniors —

Interjection: Shame.

Mr Phillips: Shame, as my colleague said. Children are now relying on property taxpayers: 500,000 young people in this province rely on social assistance for their food, their clothing and their shelter, now on the property taxpayer. What you're doing here is adding another burden on to them, and when the property tax bill comes out in total, you'll know the full fury in the community as seniors and young people fight for dignity at councils in the future.

The Acting Speaker: Is there any further debate? It being past 6 of the clock, is there unanimous consent to take a vote? Agreed.

Mr Hardeman, the parliamentary assistant, has moved second reading of Bill 98. Does the motion carry?

All those in favour?

All those opposed?

The "ayes" have it.

Mr Ed Doyle (Wentworth East): I understand, Madam Speaker, that we had unanimous consent for a five-minute bell on this.

The Acting Speaker: Call in the members. There will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1809 to 1814.

The Acting Speaker: Would the members please take their seats.

Will all those in favour of the motion please rise and be recognized one at a time.

Ayes

Baird, John R.	Hodgson, Chris	Pettit, Trevor
Bassett, Isabel	Hudak, Tim	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Boushy, Dave	Jackson, Cameron	Sampson, Rob
Brown, Jim	Johns, Helen	Saunderson, William
Chudleigh, Ted	Johnson, Bert	Shea, Derwyn
Doyle, Ed	Johnson, David	Skarica, Toni
Ecker, Janet	Johnson, Ron	Smith, Bruce
Elliott, Brenda	Kells, Morley	Snobelen, John
Fisher, Barbara	Martiniuk, Gerry	Spina, Joseph
Ford, Douglas B.	Maves, Bart	Sterling, Norman W.
Fox, Gary	McLean, Allan K.	Tascona, Joseph N.
Froese, Tom	Munro, Julia	Turnbull, David
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Vankoughnet, Bill
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Hardeman, Ernie	O'Toole, John	Young, Terence H.
Hamick, Charles	Ouellette, Jerry J.	
Hastings, John	Parker, John L.	

The Acting Speaker: All those who are opposed to the motion please rise one at a time and be recognized.

Nays

Boyd, Marion	Kormos, Peter	Pouliot, Gilles
Bradley, James J.	Lankin, Frances	Pupatello, Sandra
Christopherson, David	Marchese, Rosario	Sergio, Mario
Cordiano, Joseph	Martin, Tony	Silipo, Tony
Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 49; the nays are 14.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): We refer this bill to the standing committee on resources development for public hearings.

The Acting Speaker: So ordered.

It now being somewhat past six of the clock, this House will stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 1, at 1:30 of the clock.

We wish Alex McFedries all the best.

The House adjourned at 1817.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston
Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Chris Stockwell

Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers

Senior Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals / Greffier adjoint principal et Greffier des journaux: Alex D. McFedries
Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees / Greffière adjointe et Greffière des comités: Deborah Deller

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Algoma	Wildman, Bud (ND)	High Park-Swansea	Shea, Derwyn (PC)
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A. (L)	Huron	Johns, Helen (PC)
Beaches-Woodbine	Lankin, Frances (ND)	Kenora	Miclash, Frank (L)
Brampton North / -Nord	Spina, Joseph (PC)	Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	Gerretsen, John (L)
Brampton South / -Sud	Clement, Tony (PC)	Kitchener	Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Brant-Haldimand	Preston, Peter L. (PC)	Kitchener-Wilmot	Leadston, Gary L. (PC)
Brantford	Johnson, Ron (PC)	Lake Nipigon / Lac-Nipigon	Pouliot, Gilles (ND)
Bruce	Fisher, Barbara (PC)	Lambton	Beaubien, Marcel (PC)
Burlington South / -Sud	Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron (PC) Minister without Portfolio (seniors issues) / ministre sans portefeuille (affaires des personnes âgées)	Lanark-Renfrew	Jordan, W. Leo (PC)
	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Lawrence	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
Cambridge	Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC) Minister of Environment and Energy / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie	Leeds-Grenville	Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC) Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Carleton			Sheehan, Frank (PC)
Carleton East / -Est	Morin, Gilles E. (L)	Lincoln	Boyd, Marion (ND)
Chatham-Kent	Carroll, Jack (PC)	London Centre / -Centre	Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne (PC) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Cochrane North / -Nord	Wood, Len (ND)	London North / -Nord	Wood, Bob (PC)
Cochrane South / -Sud	Bisson, Gilles (ND)		Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H. (PC) Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Cornwall	Cleary, John C. (L)		Smith, Bruce (PC)
Don Mills	Johnson, Hon / L'hon David (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement	London South / -Sud	DeFaria, Carl (PC)
	Silipo, Tony (ND)	Markham	Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John (PC) Minister of Education and Training / ministère de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Dovercourt	Castrilli, Annamaria (L)		Marland, Margaret (PC)
Downsview	Tilson, David (PC)	Middlesex	Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob (PC) Minister without Portfolio (privatization) / ministre sans portefeuille (privatisation)
Dufferin-Peel	Flaherty, Jim (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	Grimmett, Bill (PC)
Durham Centre / -Centre	O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Mississauga North / -Nord	
Durham East / -Est	Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet (PC) Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires		
Durham West / -Ouest	Munro, Julia (PC)	Mississauga South / -Sud	
	Saunderson, Hon / L'hon William (PC) Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme	Mississauga West / -Ouest	
Durham-York			
Eglinton	North, Peter (Ind)	Muskoka-Georgian Bay / Muskoka-Baie-Georgienne	
Elgin	Hoy, Pat (L)	Nepean	Baird, John R. (PC)
Essex-Kent	Crozier, Bruce (L)	Niagara Falls	Maves, Bart (PC)
Essex South / -Sud	Ford, Douglas B. (PC)	Niagara South / -Sud	Hudak, Tim (PC)
Etobicoke-Humber	Kells, Morley (PC)	Nickel Belt	Laughren, Floyd (ND)
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Hastings, John (PC)	Nipissing	Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D. (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif
Etobicoke-Rexdale	Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC) Speaker / Président		Barrett, Toby (PC)
Etobicoke West / -Ouest	McLeod, Lyn (L)	Norfolk	Galt, Doug (PC)
	Marchese, Rosario (ND)	Northumberland	Carr, Gary (PC)
Fort William	Vankoughnet, Bill (PC)	Oakville South / -Sud	Colle, Mike (L)
Fort York	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Oakwood	Caplan, Elinor (L)
Frontenac-Addington	Elliott, Brenda (PC)	Oriole	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)
Grey-Owen Sound	Young, Terence H. (PC)	Oshawa	Patten, Richard (L)
Guelph	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	Grandmaitre, Bernard (L)
Halton Centre / -Centre	Christopherson, David (ND)	Ottawa East / -Est	Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)
Halton North / -Nord	Agostino, Dominic (L)	Ottawa-Rideau	McGuinty, Dalton (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
Hamilton Centre / -Centre	Pettit, Trevor (PC)	Ottawa South / -Sud	
Hamilton East / -Est	Ross, Lillian (PC)		Chiarelli, Robert (L)
Hamilton Mountain	Danford, Harry (PC)	Ottawa West / -Ouest	Hardeman, Ernie (PC)
Hamilton West / -Ouest		Oxford	
Hastings-Peterborough			

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Parkdale	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Scarborough North / -Nord	Curling, Alvin (L)
Parry Sound	Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L. (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances	Scarborough West / -Ouest	Brown, Jim (PC)
Perth	Johnson, Bert (PC)	Simcoe Centre / -Centre	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)
Peterborough	Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Simcoe East / -Est	McLean, Allan K. (PC)
Port Arthur	Gravelle, Michael (L)	Simcoe West / -Ouest	Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC) Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Rick (L)
Prince Edward-Lennox- South Hastings / Prince Edward-Lennox- Hastings-Sud	Fox, Gary (PC)	Sudbury East / -Est	Martel, Shelley (ND)
Quinte	Rollins, E.J. Douglas (PC)	Timiskaming	Ramsay, David (L)
Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / Chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique	Victoria-Haliburton	Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC) Minister of Natural Resources, Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre des Richesses naturelles, ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Renfrew North / -Nord	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Waterloo North / -Nord	Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Riverdale	Churley, Marilyn (ND)	Welland-Thorold	Kormos, Peter (ND)
R-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est	Villeneuve, Hon / L'hon Noble (PC) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones	Wellington	Amott, Ted (PC)
St Andrew-St Patrick	Bassett, Isabel (PC)	Wentworth East / -Est	Doyle, Ed (PC)
St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)	Wentworth North / -Nord	Skarica, Toni (PC)
St Catharines-Brock	Froese, Tom (PC)	Willowdale	Harnick, Hon / L'hon Charles (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
St George-St David	Leach, Hon / L'hon Al (PC) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement	Wilson Heights	Kwinter, Monte (L)
Sarnia	Boushy, Dave (PC)	Windsor-Riverside	Vacant
Sault Ste Marie / Sault-Sainte-Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	Windsor-Sandwich	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry (L)	Windsor-Walkerville	Duncan, Dwight (L)
Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Newman, Dan (PC)	York Centre / -Centre	Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al (PC) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	York East / -Est	Parker, John L. (PC)
Scarborough-Ellesmere	Mushinski, Hon / L'hon Marilyn (PC) Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs	York Mills	Tumbull, David (PC)
		York-Mackenzie	Klees, Frank (PC)
		Yorkview	Sergio, Mario (L)
		York South / -Sud	Kennedy, Gerard (L)

List arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month.

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois.

CONTENTS

Thursday 6 March 1997

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Audit Amendment Act, 1996

Bill 74, <i>Mr Grandmaître</i>	
Mr Grandmaître	7425, 7431
Ms Churley	7426
Ms Bassett	7427
Mrs McLeod	7427
Mr Wettlaufer	7428
Mr Gerretsen	7429
Mr Fox	7430
Mr Bradley	7430
Mr McLean	7431
Mr Baird	7431
Agreed to	7438

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Foundation Act, 1997

Bill 123, <i>Mr Leadston</i>	
Mr Leadston	7432, 7438
Mr Gerretsen	7433
Mr Len Wood	7433
Mr McLean	7434
Ms Churley	7435
Mr Bob Wood	7436
Mr O'Toole	7436
Mr Miclash	7436
Mr Bradley	7437
Agreed to	7438

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

International Women's Day

Ms Castrilli	7438
--------------	------

Municipal restructuring

Mr Pouliot	7439
------------	------

Nutrition Month

Mrs Johns	7439
-----------	------

Municipal restructuring

Mr Phillips	7439
-------------	------

Niagara Escarpment

Ms Churley	7439
------------	------

International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Mr Shea	7440
---------	------

French-language hospital services

Mr Morin	7440
----------	------

Municipal restructuring

Mr Christopherson	7440
-------------------	------

Rural health services

Mr Barrett	7440
------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hospital restructuring

Mr McGuinty	7445, 7448
Mr Harris	7445, 7447, 7452
Mr Kennedy	7446, 7451
Mr Wilson	7446, 7449, 7451
Ms Castrilli	7446
Mr Kwinter	7446
Mr Hampton	7447
Mrs Boyd	7447
Mr Colle	7452
Ms Churley	7453

Municipal restructuring

Mr Silipo	7449
Mr Harris	7449

Community care access centres

Mrs Marland	7450
Mr Jackson	7450

Job creation

Mr North	7450
Mr Harris	7450

Anti-hate guide

Mr Marchese	7452
Mr Snobelen	7452

Tourism

Mr Froese	7452
Mr Saunderson	7452

PETITIONS

Class size

Mr Bartolucci	7454
---------------	------

Education legislation

Ms Lankin	7454
-----------	------

Port Colborne General Hospital

Mr Hudak	7454
----------	------

Bibliothèques publiques

M. Lalonde	7454
------------	------

Education funding

Ms Churley	7455
------------	------

Fire safety

Mr Ron Johnson	7455
----------------	------

Education reform

Mr Ruprecht	7455
-------------	------

Education legislation

Ms Lankin	7455
-----------	------

Fire safety

Mr Froese	7455
-----------	------

North York Branson Hospital

Mr Kwinter	7456
------------	------

Education legislation

Ms Lankin	7456
-----------	------

Municipal restructuring

Mr Hardeman	7456
Mr Gerretsen	7456

St Peter's Hospital

Mr Christopherson	7456
-------------------	------

Fire safety

Mrs Elliott	7457
-------------	------

SECOND READINGS

Fair Municipal Finance Act, 1997,

Bill 106, <i>Mr Eves</i>	
Agreed to	7454

Development Charges Act, 1996,

Bill 98, <i>Mr Leach</i>	
Mr Marchese	7457, 7466, 7473
Mrs Marland	7464
Mr Gerretsen	7465, 7468
Mrs Boyd	7465, 7468
Mr O'Toole	7465, 7468
Mr Smith	7466, 7469
Mr Bradley	7469, 7473
Mr Phillips	7469, 7474
Mr Baird	7473
Agreed to	7474

OTHER BUSINESS

Alex McFedries

The Speaker	7441, 7444
-------------	------------

Mr Dave Johnson	7441
-----------------	------

Mr Morin	7441
----------	------

Mr Bradley	7442
------------	------

Ms Churley	7442
------------	------

Ms Lankin	7443
-----------	------

Mr Bert Johnson	7443
-----------------	------

Visitor

The Speaker	7445
-------------	------

Business of the House

Mr Sterling	7457
-------------	------

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 6 mars 1997

PÉTITIONS

Bibliothèques publiques

M. Lalonde	7454
------------	------

CALON
XI
-D23



No. 175

N° 175

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 1 April 1997

Mardi 1^{er} avril 1997



Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 1 April 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 1^{er} avril 1997

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX

M. Bernard Grandmaître (Ottawa-Est) : Le 22 mars dernier, plus de 10 000 personnes de toutes les régions de la province et de toutes les affiliations politiques se sont rassemblées pour dire au gouvernement et à sa Commission de restructuration des soins de santé qu'ils commettaient une grave erreur en proposant de fermer l'hôpital Montfort. Dans les jours prochains le gouvernement va recevoir une pétition avec bien au-delà de 100 000 noms protestant contre la fermeture de Montfort.

Tout dernièrement le ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones s'est brusquement réveillé comme si on l'avait piqué avec une épingle à chapeau, comme dans le temps du Règlement 17. Il a dit qu'il venait d'apprendre que Montfort était le seul hôpital capable de former des professionnels de la santé en français et qu'il allait en informer les intéressés. Le ministre sera-t-il aussi le dernier à comprendre que fermer l'hôpital Montfort, un hôpital d'élite, est injuste et injustifiable, même du point de vue du mandat de la commission de restructuration ?

Le ministre sait que la population francophone de l'Ontario lui demande à toutes fins pratiques unanimement de les appuyer publiquement pour empêcher une grave injustice. Il est temps pour le ministre de s'occuper de ceux et celles qu'il représente. Monsieur le ministre, quand allez-vous agir ?

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): I rise today on this first day of a week in which we will be considering some legislation that will have a very severe and directly negative impact on communities and the way that we deliver services across this province. I speak, of course, of Bill 103 and Bill 104, but most particular to my community is the concern that we have around the impact of that bill on Sault Ste Marie.

I have been in my community for the last two weeks and have spent some significant time talking with my constituents. To a person, they have shared with me their very real reservations about the way that school boards are going to be restructured and the impact that may have on the delivery of services, those services for our students that we've all come to appreciate in this province.

I visited a couple of schools when I was home, one the S.F. Howe public school, and the other the Francis H.

Clergue public school in Sault Ste Marie. I have to tell you, I was totally impressed with the atmosphere that was being created there by the administration and by the teachers. They tell me that they're very concerned, at S.F. Howe in particular, that a very effective junior kindergarten/senior kindergarten program that is operating there now that serves the needs of local families and parents may disappear if any more money is taken out of the system. So today on behalf of Sault Ste Marie I object to the imposition of Bill 104.

AGRICULTURE AND FOOD WEEK

Mr Gary Fox (Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings): It gives me great pleasure today to rise in this Legislature and salute the farmers of Ontario.

As the members of this House, rural and urban alike, are no doubt aware, Ontario has the largest and most diversified agriculture and food industry in Canada. It is an industry we can all be proud of. The diversity of products harvested from Ontario farms can be matched nowhere else in this country and indeed in the world. Ontario produces more than 200 commodities, accounts for 38% of all Canadian agrifood economic activity and leads all provinces in agrifood exports with \$5 billion annually. Our farm products make their way on to tables of consumers across Canada and, increasingly, around the world.

As a food producer myself, I know all about the hard work of the dedicated farm families who are the backbone of the industry. As business operators they invest their time, money and management, they pay taxes, create jobs and build communities. They deserve our thanks and our support.

It is in this spirit that I ask all members of the Legislature to join me in recognizing the vital role the agriculture industry plays in this province and the important contribution it makes to Ontario's economy by declaring this week, April 1 to 4, Agriculture and Food Week.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): You know what? I'd like to hear the rest, but you're out of time. Sorry.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): We understand that the Minister of Health intends to eliminate 253 beds for severely disturbed psychiatric patients in Metro Toronto. Has he considered the sheer chaos and confrontational clashes that this will create between our police and the psychiatric patients? We're not surprised that Alison Guyton, executive director of the mental health program services for Metro, said that restructuring plans to cut the

psychiatric beds in Metro will cause "serious problems." Does he think Metro has the capacity to pick up the slack of deinstitutionalization? Absolutely not. The tragedy of Mr Yu, a mental patient shot dead on a TTC bus, will be repeated as aberrant mental patients will be pushed out of hospitals. Public safety will also be affected. Is the minister prepared to take responsibility for such actions?

The minister is saying that beds will not close unless community support is in place. Let's look at Queen Street Mental Health Centre. Hundreds of patients are wandering around the streets, marching in and out of this hospital where the recidivism rate is over 76%. Are community support services in place? No. How can the present situation improve when the minister cuts beds and kicks out hundreds more? Let me give the minister an example. Last year our police were called over 300 times to apprehend —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.

CASINOS

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr Speaker, you will know that I have raised a concern in this Legislature that the Mike Harris Tories have decided to force a casino on my community, the community of the Beaches, despite the fact that the residents of the Beaches do not want a casino in our neighbourhood.

I have asked the Premier to give me assurances that he will not force it on our community when our community doesn't want it. He has refused to answer that question. He said that because they're replacing roving charitable casinos, we just shouldn't be worried. I want to let you know what the difference is.

The roving casinos operate for only three days at a time during the daytime and the evening; these new permanent casinos will operate for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, throughout the whole year. There is a maximum of only 30 tables in the roving casinos; now there will be a maximum of 40 tables and 150 video slot machines. In the old casinos, the roving casinos, there was a \$10 maximum on the bet; now the maximum is going to be \$100. Before, there was \$100 million a year in Ontario bet in charitable casinos; now there will be over \$1 billion.

One of the biggest changes is that before, during the election, Mike Harris said no community would have a casino unless they voted for it in a referendum; now he refuses to allow a referendum. The people of Beaches-Woodbine don't want it, and we don't want these big-time operators like the Ontario Jockey Club and Casino Windsor, which have both expressed an interest in running the casino in our community. We don't want them in our neighbourhood. We say no.

Interruption.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Just to remind the gallery, you can't applaud; you can watch.

1340

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

Mrs Helen Johns (Huron): In Ontario, a wide variety of high-quality foods are readily available at competitive prices. Ontario's agrifood industry does a wonderful job

presenting the consumer with economical, appealing, safe and nutritious foods. In reality, the process of delivering food to consumers is highly complex, employs thousands of people and generates billions of dollars in economic activity.

In Huron county, the area I represent, farm-gate sales are nearly \$450 million. Huron is running seventh in the country, ahead of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island or the total farm-gate sales of New Brunswick and Newfoundland combined. Tonight the agricultural community of Ontario is pleased to invite the members of the Ontario Legislature to a Taste of Ontario, which showcases the world's finest food and wine produced right here our province.

I remind colleagues that with every possible opportunity we should thank a farmer and commend the hard-working agricultural community in Ontario for their dedication to the industry and their tremendous accomplishments. Please join me in showing your appreciation of our representatives from the agricultural community who are in the east lobby today.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): When Premier Harris visits St Catharines to attend a Conservative Party fund-raising dinner tomorrow night he should remember his commitment to the people of Ontario and their hospitals in the election campaign leaders' debate in May 1995. Mike Harris stated clearly, and I quote, "Certainly I can guarantee that it's not my plan to close hospitals."

The Niagara hospital restructuring steering committee, faced with the knowledge that an additional \$44 million will be cut from hospital operating budgets on top of the dramatic cuts already being implemented, has recommended the closing of the Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines, the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital in Grimsby, Douglas Memorial in Fort Erie, Port Colborne hospital and Niagara-on-the-Lake hospital.

This is completely unacceptable to me and to the people of the Niagara Peninsula, and all the announcements of so-called reinvestments will not fool the people of Niagara into accepting this severe reduction in hospital services. When Dr David Foot, the author of the best-selling book *Boom, Bust and Echo*, was asked what he would recommend to Premier Harris for the Niagara region with its demographic makeup, an older-than-average population, he stated boldly and clearly, "Don't close hospitals."

The closing of Niagara hospitals to feed the bizarre provincial income tax that will benefit the wealthiest people to the greatest extent is sheer madness. The people who will be outside of the Ramada Parkway to stand up for their hospitals will certainly bring this message home clearly to the Premier of this province.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : L'année 1997 va se marquer dans l'histoire de la province comme une année très noire. Au mois de mars, le gouvernement ontarien a annoncé l'intention de fermer l'hôpital Montfort, le seul hôpital francophone de la province, le seul

hôpital où on fait la formation des professionnels dans le domaine de la santé pour la province et le seul hôpital francophone en Ontario auquel nous dans le nord-est et d'autres places en Ontario avons la chance de faire nos références pour ceux et celles qui ont besoin des services de santé en français.

Mais il ne s'arrête pas là. Dans le domaine de la santé, on a vu en 1997, il n'y a qu'une semaine, que le gouvernement de l'Ontario a refusé de donner les fonds nécessaires au centre de santé communautaire de Timmins pour continuer ses travaux, pour desservir la population francophone de Timmins quand ça vient aux services de santé en français.

Je pense que ça démontre que ce gouvernement n'est pas engagé à donner les services nécessaires aux francophones de la province. Ils regardent la francophonie de l'Ontario d'une manière que je trouve très triste. Il nous a pris des années de mettre en place des services pour les francophones, et pendant 1997 le gouvernement de l'Ontario a l'intention de tout fermer pour les francophones. Ce n'est pas acceptable.

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Tom Froese (St Catharines-Brock): Contrary to the member for St Catharines, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Minister of Health, Jim Wilson, and the minister responsible for seniors' issues, Cam Jackson, for making the health care reinvestment announcement recently in St Catharines. As the St Catharines Standard front page story said, "The health care money was welcomed."

The reinvestment of \$8.7 million was for funding brand-new programs which include mental health projects and long-term community services. As Minister Wilson said, and I agree completely, "It is essential that these types of community programs be in place before any hospitals merge, close or beds are lost."

What is also important to me and to the entire Niagara region is that the ministers listened. They listened to the experts in the community who gave advice and opinions on how to reinvest. They listened to the Niagara caucus and our concerns that restructuring be done right, particularly as we move forward with the hospital and health care restructuring process. For me personally, I expect them to continue to listen, since five of the Niagara region's 10 hospitals are in my St Catharines-Brock riding.

Once again, thank you to Ministers Wilson and Jackson for the much-needed reinvestment.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE OFFICERS

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House the following appointments that have been made to the list of officers who serve this House:

Effective today, Mrs Deborah Deller will assume responsibilities as Clerk Assistant and executive director of legislative services. Mrs Deller is well known to all the members and I'm certain that she will continue to provide her valued advice to you.

Mr Dennis Clark, our new Sergeant at Arms, assumes his responsibilities today.

Ms Lisa Freedman and Mr Todd Decker have been appointed clerks at the table. As table officers, they will serve the members in a permanent capacity and assist the Clerk and Clerk Assistant in providing procedural advice to the Speaker and to the members.

I am certain that all members will join with me in congratulating Mrs Deller, Mr Clark, Ms Freedman and Mr Decker as they assume their new duties. Congratulations and welcome.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

AIR QUALITY

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): The Ontario government believes the people of this province have the right to breathe clean air. Unfortunately this right is being threatened by increasing smog levels, especially in the greater Toronto area and throughout southwestern Ontario.

In addition to the severe toll it exacts on our environment, smog is known to aggravate a wide range of serious health ailments, especially respiratory illnesses such as asthma and bronchitis. My ministry estimates, based on studies by Health Canada and others, that ground level ozone and other components of smog cause about 1,800 premature deaths annually in our province. Worst of all, it is the most vulnerable, that is, children and the elderly, who suffer the most.

The Ontario government is taking action on a number of fronts to combat this problem.

Our ministry has prepared an accelerated three-year plan to ensure that Ontario standards, with an emphasis on air, are brought up to date after 20 years of neglect. This will mean tougher standards than those currently on the books, some by as much as 600%. Late last year, I placed this proposed plan on the environmental registry for public consultation.

In addition, my ministry is leading the development of a comprehensive smog plan in partnership with industry, business and the public. We have set aggressive goals to significantly reduce the number of smog alert days in southern Ontario by the year 2015.

We will shortly release the results of two pilot projects on vehicle emissions testing. The information and experience we gained give us a solid foundation for developing a vehicle inspection and maintenance program that is practical, affordable and convenient for motorists.

1350

Today I am pleased to inform the Legislature that we have taken an important step to improve Ontario's air quality this coming smog season. We have amended regulation 271 to require gasoline refiners and blenders to produce lower-volatility gasoline from May 15 to September 14 each year. This will mean that there will be significantly less smog-causing fumes released annually from summer-grade gasoline. In fact, with the amended regulation 271 in place, we expect to see an 18,000-tonne

reduction in the amount of smog-causing volatile organic compounds released into the air each year.

The government is committed to improving the health of our environment for the people of Ontario. We are taking action to provide cleaner air through a series of tough measures against smog. The amendment to regulation 271 will help to protect the air quality of our communities. A reduction in the amount of gasoline fumes escaping into the atmosphere will mean less smog and healthier lungs for us all.

ONTARIO PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

Hon Ernie L. Eves (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): I rise today to table information made public under the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act. We on this side of the Legislature have always understood that tax dollars do not belong to government, they belong to taxpayers. It is our job as government to make sure we manage the dollars wisely and carefully. When the public sector spends money, it is spending taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. Taxpayers have a right to know how their money is being spent.

To this end, on November 29, 1995, we introduced the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act. Under this legislation, public sector organizations that receive public funding must disclose names, positions and compensation paid to employees whose salary was \$100,000 or more in the previous calendar year.

Last year, under this new legislation, often referred to as the sunshine law, we tabled for the first time information on the salaries of the broader public sector employees who earn more than \$100,000. This was a major step towards making the public sector more accountable to Ontario taxpayers. Today, once again, I am making available information on compensation for senior public sector employees. Disclosure under this legislation gives taxpayers a chance to see how an organization's performance and responsibilities compare to the way it compensates its senior people.

Organizations subject to this legislation include: Ontario government ministries and their agencies; the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; provincial crown corporations and agencies such as Ontario Hydro, the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and the Workers' Compensation Board; municipalities, school boards, hospitals, colleges and universities; and organizations that receive transfer payments from the province of at least \$1 million a year or 10% of their gross revenue if that amount is \$120,000 or more. Organizations are required to give the public access to this information by March 31 of the following calendar year.

I note that this year the compiled information will be available on the Ministry of Finance's Web site on the Internet as well.

We made a commitment to the people of Ontario to take a more open and accountable approach to government by publishing salaries paid to senior public sector officials. We are keeping our word and will continue to do so.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I'm pleased to respond to the Minister of Finance's statement.

We certainly look forward to the report and obviously have no difficulty with the law, although I will say this: For our party, we had expected the Minister of Finance to be talking about employment. We have been off for several weeks. The minister issued a report dated March 19 that indicated that in the last six months Ontario has lost 57,000 jobs. The rest of Canada has gained 72,000 jobs. I don't mean to belittle the report, and certainly all of the unemployed in the province will want to get at the Web site and look at all those people out there who can make more than \$100,000 and be envious of them, probably get angry with them, but for us the priority is jobs and we see from your own report 57,000 fewer jobs in the province of Ontario than six months ago.

I remember when Mike Harris, then in opposition, went around the province and said he was going to solve this problem. We now have 30,000 more people out of work in Ontario, according to the Minister of Finance's own report, than the day the Premier became the Premier. We find the unemployment rate going up. We find that the young people in this province now have an unemployment rate of 18.8%, up 2.3% from the same period a year ago. I'm sure the people of Ontario, particularly all those young people unemployed and looking for work, will be interested in all those people making more than \$100,000. We certainly will welcome that information as well.

But we would have expected that the priority of the government today would have been the Minister of Finance getting up today and telling us what he's going to do about unemployment. The numbers come out this Friday. They can no longer continue to get worse, but we are going to have to see tremendous improvement over the next few months to even begin to make a dent in the growing unemployment in this province.

AIR QUALITY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): It's not hard to figure out that the plans of the government and the Ministry of Environment are going up in vapour as the member makes this announcement today, because we find he has a ministry that is facing unprecedented budget cuts. Fully one third of his budget, millions upon millions of dollars, has been cut. We have one third of staff disappearing in the Ministry of Environment.

The minister can change all the standards he wants to change, but if he has nobody to do the inspections, nobody to do the enforcement and nobody to do the prosecutions, it's just on paper; it makes no difference to the people of this province.

As for his announcement on vehicle emissions, this must be at least the sixth time I've heard this announcement from the last minister and this minister. We have two minor pilot projects and they have done absolutely nothing else to deal with this problem.

In an interjection I mentioned the Reid vapour pressure to the minister and he looked at me blankly as though he didn't know what Reid vapour pressure was. I won't ask him during this question period, but supposedly the volatility of gasoline is being lowered in this province. I would like to know why he didn't include the level in his

statement. It must be because he's embarrassed about the level.

All this government has done is abandon the environment. The only contribution they make to it is having the minister get up and announce and re-announce proposed programs for somewhere along the line. He tells us that by the year 2015, some 18 years from now, we're going to have air that is cleaner. People in this province are asking why this government hasn't already taken action. The air hovering over the Niagara Escarpment is getting bad and they've taken the Niagara Escarpment away from the jurisdiction of this minister, the only person who had any interest in saving the Niagara Escarpment, and given it to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Everybody knows what the Ministry of Natural Resources thinks of the Ministry of Environment. That's gone now. I can see why the minister would want to deflect attention from this power grab the Premier has initiated, taking away his responsibility for the Niagara Escarpment Commission and giving it to the Minister of Natural Resources and the good old boys in the Ontario Legislature, who will now make sure that we have an Escarpment Hilton, an Escarpment Holiday Inn and an Escarpment Ramada.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I'm interested in the minister's announcement today, given that this minister and his ministry are about to rewrite almost every line of environmental protection in this province, calling it red tape and job killers.

This ministry to date — I'm just going to mention a few and I'm going to talk specifically to air quality, leaving aside the other ones today — has eliminated the Advisory Committee on Environmental Standards and cut funding for public transportation, and we all know that good, accessible public transportation goes a long way in terms of avoiding ground-level ozone. Bill 20, your new so-called Planning Act: You've gutted all the environmental protections in that act and in fact encourage urban sprawl, which encourages more individual traffic on the street. You've lifted the ban on incineration. That also will lead to more air pollution. They've also laid off a third of their staff. About 32% of those staff are air staff.

So what does this all come down to? Volunteerism. I presume that over time some of these new standards are going to be developed. Who is going to be out there to make sure there is enforcement and compliance? Nobody. I can see where all this is going to go. This is all about volunteerism, and you're going to be able to report things are getting better because there's not going to be anybody there to tell us what's really going on. You are totally abandoning the environment, and people will see through what is happening today.

The last thing I want to talk about is this announcement that there are going to be two pilot programs for vehicle emissions testing. Our government, the NDP government, already did a big pilot program. We knew, as you should know, as a result of that pilot program that it is absolutely necessary to now proceed with the difficult issues, which I admit are there, in terms of a mandatory program. Get on with it.

Minister, you yourself stood in this House and said to the media there are about 1,800 deaths a year that we

know of in Ontario due directly to bad air, smog, and you stand here today and talk about more voluntary programs. The people in this province just want you to get on with it. Stand up and tell the people that you're going to move ahead with real air pollution control here today. That is not what you are doing, and you should admit it.

1400

ONTARIO PUBLIC SECTOR SALARIES

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): We heard briefly from the Minister of Finance. What we heard from the Minister of Finance was another government attempt at a diversion. There are real issues out there for the Minister of Finance to deal with. One of the issues is, as has been stated already, the fact that the job numbers are getting worse, not better, and in particular much worse for young people.

Secondly, the Minister of Finance could deal with the fact that the government's tax scheme is overwhelmingly benefiting wealthy people, but it sure isn't producing any jobs. The people who already have incomes in excess of \$500,000 or \$1 million a year are doing very well, thanks to this government's tax scheme, but that tax scheme is not producing any jobs. But the minister wants to stay away from all that; he doesn't want to talk about that.

The minister also doesn't want to talk about how this is the government that has raised the deputy ministers' salaries from the \$130,000-to-\$140,000 range up into the \$170,000-to-\$180,000 range. This is the government that insists that the highest-paid civil servants should be paid even more, but it doesn't want to acknowledge that either.

Also, this is a government that has recently hired a civil servant to sell off to the private sector some of the province's best and most productive assets. The Minister of Finance could have disclosed today the salary of that individual. We understand that individual is going to be paid something in excess of \$200,000 a year, but no disclosure on that.

Again, a rather inadequate attempt at a diversion by the Minister of Finance. He doesn't want to talk about the fact that no jobs are being created. He doesn't want to talk about the fact that his tax scheme is only benefiting the wealthiest people in this province, not producing any jobs. He doesn't want to talk about the fact that this is a government that has overwhelmingly raised the salaries of the richest —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.

TIME ALLOCATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order which I will ask you to take into consideration and perhaps reserve on. You may in your deliberations find that in fact it involves a point of privilege, but I raise it as a point of order pursuant to section 46(a), which is the section of the standing orders that sets out the right of the government to move a time allocation motion. As you know, the government has, pursuant to that section, moved a time allocation motion with respect to Bill 103. The relevant sections of that time allocation motion that I want to

address are paragraph 4, which sets out, "That the standing committee on general government shall be authorized to meet to consider the bill for clause-by-clause consideration commencing Thursday, March 6, 1997, from 9 am to 12 pm and from 3:30 pm until completion of clause-by-clause," and paragraph 5, which sets out the requirement for all proposed amendments to be filed with the clerk of the committee by 7 pm on March 5, and that by 5 pm on Thursday, March 6, those amendments not yet moved would be deemed to be moved, and then it governs the method by which those amendments would be voted on.

The other relevant clause of the time allocation motion that I will refer you to is paragraph 8, which sets out that one hour shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House, and then proceeds to set out that at the end of that time any amendments that had not been moved would be deemed to have been moved and sets out the process for disposing of all remaining amendments and sections of the bill.

Mr Speaker, the point that I want to raise with you is one that I believe has not been explored in the Legislature before and it is with respect to the actual time allocation motion that was passed and the intent of the members of the assembly when that motion was passed — our understanding and our intent.

If you look to the precedent of how bills have been handled within committee and if you look to the actual instructions set out in this motion, I think you will agree that the members of this Legislative Assembly would have had the understanding that during the clause-by-clause session set out on March 6 the members of that committee would have been dealing with substantive amendments to the bill that the government and opposition parties would have proposed and those substantive amendments to the bill at that time, during clause-by-clause, would have been debated and disposed of, as is set out by the means provided for in the time allocation motion. As you will be aware that did not happen. The government chose not to proceed with tabling amendments at that time and in fact informed people that amendments would be tabled when the Legislature came back for the committee of the whole process.

I would argue, now that the government has made an announcement about the nature of those amendments and the substantive number of those amendments, which have not been shared with the entire assembly but have been shared with the critics of the two opposition parties, but now that it is in the public domain we are aware that they will be making a significant number of amendments to the bill and are proposing to do that during the committee of the whole.

It is incumbent upon you, Mr Speaker, to look to whether the intent of the time allocation motion has been met or whether it has been violated by the government's actions. I put to you that the members of this assembly, both based on precedent of how bills, even time-allocated bills, are normally dealt with as they go through a committee process, and based on the very fact that the government itself only set out in paragraph 8 of the time allocation motion one hour to deal with amendments in committee of the whole, that it would be a natural

understanding that the vast majority of the substantive amendments would have been dealt with in the clause-by-clause process and that there would be, as is often the case, some further cleanup amendments, if I may call them that, or further amendments, but of a less substantive number or perhaps nature, that would be dealt with during committee of the whole.

The intent of the members of the assembly, who have ownership of this time allocation motion, who debated this and who passed this, our understanding of what was intended by the motion that we passed must be part of your consideration as to whether the government has in fact violated the intent of that motion by bringing forward those amendments now, only at the time of committee of the whole, and failing to do so during clause-by-clause.

Mr Speaker, the only redress that I can see available, if you do in consideration find that there has been a violation by the government of the intent of the time allocation motion passed by the members of this assembly, is that the government would be compelled to reconvene the committee and take those amendments to committee for clause-by-clause. There may be other methods of redress that you might think of that I'm not aware of.

As I have said, I do not believe this argument or point of order has been raised before and we are unable to find precedent to guide us in making this point of order and making the arguments to you, Mr Speaker. But I simply conclude by saying that you are the guardian of the rules of this House and of the wishes of the members of this House and that the time allocation motion that was passed must be interpreted with the understanding and intent of the members of the Legislative Assembly who debated and who passed that motion, not the legislative agenda of the government or their wishes or their problems, their ineptness or anything else that may have caused this situation to arise, that the amendments were not tabled in the normal fashion during the committee.

When you look at the precedent of how bills have been dealt with in the past, and particularly when you look at the construction of this time allocation motion which set it out for clause-by-clause and then a very limited time in committee of the whole, I believe you will find that the understanding of the members of the assembly is quite different than how this bill has actually been handled by the government. I would ask you to give consideration to that point of order and rule on it at your convenience.

1410

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I think indeed there is a valid point being raised in that there was an expectation from members of the opposition that any amendments of significance would have been before the committee considering this bill, as opposed to being brought in at the very last minute for consideration in committee of the whole.

Recognizing that the time allocation motion calls for only one hour of debate of all the amendments, of all the changes of all the sections of the bill, and looking at the fact that the government brought in what it considers to be significant amendments to the bill — the government itself, through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I believe through the government House leader, through the

Premier, as a whole has indicated that it believes these to be significant amendments to legislation, yet we did not see these amendments until the very last minute — those amendments will have to be considered with all other amendments within a period of one hour within that time allocation.

The government's position would have been stronger, it seems to me, in this regard had the government brought forward these amendments during the committee hearings and had those amendments passed. It has a majority. If the majority of the government members saw fit, they could have passed those amendments at that time. Now it seems to me there should be significant debate on each of those significant amendments, not only by the government but by the opposition. We are being restricted by means of a time allocation motion to closing off debate after just one hour.

It seems to me that democracy will not be well served, that the legislative process certainly will not be well served. I think the legislation, as it eventually emerges if the government decides to proceed with the legislation, and we hope it does not, will not be the best possible piece of legislation because of the lack of time to deal adequately with the amendments the government has brought forward and the amendments the opposition has brought forward and will bring forward during consideration in committee of the whole of all the bill, the clause-by-clause of the bill, tomorrow when the government brings forward this legislation for consideration in committee of the whole.

I hope you will look at it in that light. It is a different light, I think. The opposition is putting forward a significant and compelling case for at the very minimum an expansion of the amount of time available, at the maximum for having the government go back and start the process once again, at least back at second reading and start the process once again: Go back to committee, deal with these matters in committee and then bring forward whatever it wishes to at a later point in time.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): There is nothing unusual about this process that has been undertaken. This is a normal committee of the whole process. It is a procedure that has been utilized I'm sure by parties opposite when they were in government between 1985 and 1990, and 1990 and 1995 —

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues): To a greater extent than any other government.

Hon David Johnson: — and, I'm informed, to a greater extent. This is a legitimate process. It allows for the case whereby public hearings are held, standing committee is in order, and amendments can come forward through the standing committee process. To the degree that amendments are not prepared or to the degree that further thought is required, then those amendments are legitimately entertained in the committee of the whole.

This is a process on which we've been working closely with the staff involved. We are assured that this is a normal process that has been pursued in the past. Indeed, unless my memory is incorrect, I believe that the social contract, for example, is a case in point where there were

literally dozens, if not hundreds, of amendments that were put through the committee of the whole process.

Mr Speaker, I think you'll find on reflection that this is a normal process, the process to handle amendments which have come through the committee process. I don't think it would be appropriate to endeavour to understand motives or intent, or whatever, and to make rulings based on some machiavellian motives or intent, or whatever the opposition parties are alluding to.

It's simply a normal process: committee hearings, standing committee clause-by-clause, committee of the whole as a legitimate tool. It's been used down through the ages and I am quite confident that it will be used in future years as a normal part of the parliamentary process.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you to the government House leader, the member for St Catharines and the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Let's just be clear on a couple of issues up front. This House has adopted a motion for time allocation. Therefore, the Speaker and this Legislature are seized by that motion. That motion stipulates the requirements that we must live with, with respect to Bill 103 and any other bill that falls under time allocation.

The other fact is that amendments, be it at committee or be it at committee of the whole, are always in order. Any amendment can be made at either stage. An amendment doesn't necessarily have to be made at committee level and then also at the committee of the whole; they can be made at either/or. Particularly at committee, there are quite a few. But contrarily, if you, the opposition, lose a vote at committee, you may move the same amendment at committee of the whole.

Considering those facts, it may be unusual for opposition parties to be dealing with this bill in this fashion, it may be unusual that it's approached in this way, but let's be clear: Unusual doesn't make something out of order. Clearly, reading the time allocation motion, understanding that amendments are always in order and having been seized by that motion that was adopted by this House, it's academic. It would be considered in order now. Whether I reserved or not, it would still be in order and we would still have to carry on, as I see it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think it's important that we not kid ourselves here today and this week. We understand that you've got the numbers, that the government, having a majority, can do anything it really pleases. But surely the issue is not what you can do; it's what you should do. In the circumstances of the megacity bill, it's important to recollect that just a short while ago the people of Metropolitan Toronto voted overwhelmingly against that bill. They gave it very careful consideration and decided that they would have nothing to do with it. What do you think you ought to be doing in the circumstances? What should you be doing?

In particular, should you be ignoring the clear and unequivocal response of the people of Metropolitan Toronto to your bill?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): To the Leader of the Opposition, we obviously took the results of the votes into consideration, as we took into consideration the 600 individuals who presented their position to the standing committee. We listened to that. We took it all into consideration and that's why we made a number of amendments to the bill that, in my opinion, satisfy the direction that the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto want to go in. What we're going to end up with is a single, unified city, while preserving local communities and local identities, which is what the majority of people in this municipality were telling us.

1420

Mr McGuinty: Your amendments do not in any way, shape or form alter the very substance of the bill. The people of Metropolitan Toronto said they don't want you to take six cities and force them into one. Your bill continues to do that right up to this very moment.

They're also very concerned about taxes. At one point in time, this party had an obsession with taxes and keeping them down. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation said last week — and they said this taking into consideration the recent amendments — “Even with your bogus amendments, it's a sure bet for higher taxes.” You yourself have refused to guarantee that property taxes wouldn't rise in a megacity. Why are you going to ram this bill through and ensure that property taxes are going to go up as a result?

Hon Mr Leach: In my opinion, nothing could be further from being correct, that taxes are going to rise as a result of this. Any time you eliminate waste and duplication, any time you take seven of something and put them into one, any time you take six fire departments and create one, there are going to be savings. I don't think most reasonable people would have any problem in recognizing the ability to save the taxpayers money. We firmly believe that we will save \$865 million in the first three years and probably \$300 million a year every year after that, while providing government that is closer to the people, government that has less waste, less duplication and is more efficient.

Mr McGuinty: Not only are taxes going to go up; you should know that there's going to be a resulting loss in services and, just as importantly, there's going to be a loss of a sense of community. You know that Metro Toronto is recognized internationally as the best city in the world. That award was based largely on the fact that there is a strong sense of community lending shape to the cities in this region.

Your megacity is clearly going to dramatically weaken our communities at a time when they need those linkages. Furthermore, your bill does nothing to create the necessary linkages among members of the GTA. That's where the real problem is, and you're doing nothing about that whatsoever. Why are you deliberately ramming through your megacity, which is going to seriously weaken our sense of community in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon Mr Leach: The Leader of the Opposition is mistaken again, because we are dealing with the GTA.

I've said repeatedly that I plan to have the GTA services board in place to coincide with the creation of a single, unified city in Metropolitan Toronto. We recognize that the GTA is a single entity that has to be coordinated from Hamilton right through to Oshawa, and we plan to do that. There are individuals working in the GTA at the present time, as we speak, to bring forward proposals to ensure that the GTA is coordinated.

As far as protecting communities in the new city of Toronto is concerned, by establishing the neighbourhood committees and community councils there will be an opportunity for local communities to have better representation, closer opportunities to speak to their local councillors, without having the confusion of multiple levels of government, which create a lot of waste and duplication.

EDUCATION REFORM

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My second question is for the Minister of Education. There is no doubt whatsoever that there is room for improvement in education in Ontario, and there are all kinds of good ideas out there. But if you look at them carefully, you'll see that they are held together by a single, common thread. Those good ideas are grounded in the notion that any improvements must, at a minimum, not harm classroom education. The problem is that none of those good ideas is found inside your Bill 104. Bill 104 is grounded in the notion that money can and will be found in education, and this will come at the expense of what is going on inside our classrooms.

The people who have presented at the committee which dealt with Bill 104 are very concerned about your plans to take more money out of education. I'm going to ask for your honesty on this issue. Tell me, how much more money do you intend to cut from Ontario's education budget?

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): To the Leader of the Opposition, that is absolutely untrue; there is nothing in Bill 104 about reducing spending in education. Bill 104 is about moving from a very old system of governance in our education system to a new system. It's about revitalizing our education system in Ontario, it's about reducing bureaucracy, it's about reducing waste and duplication, and it's about reducing the number of politicians who are involved in our school system from about 1,900 to about 700. It's a bill that's supported by a large number of parents, students and taxpayers across Ontario who recognize the need for a renewed education system in Ontario.

Mr McGuinty: Minister, your credibility on this issue drops faster than Bre-X stock. You have personally refused to guarantee funding. You yourself speculated openly —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order. Leader of the official opposition.

Mr McGuinty: I apologize, I might have touched a raw nerve on the part of investors in the government caucus.

Minister, you yourself have refused to provide any guarantees whatsoever with respect to funding. You have

openly speculated about cutting another \$1 billion, and last week there was a published report that you're looking at slashing as much as \$1.5 billion from Ontario's education budget.

Let's talk about Bill 104 for a moment. At the committee hearings, about 90% of the parents and educators who appeared before the committee opposed your bill, saying it's going to harm their children's education. Why have you ignored the concerns of those presenters? Why have you made no real and substantive improvements to Bill 104? Why have you done that?

Hon Mr Snobelen: If there is anyone's credibility in this chamber coming into question, it would be that of the Leader of the Opposition, who continually spins into Bill 104 a whole variety of other things that may or may not happen. Bill 104 is about getting rid of waste and duplication, about reducing the number of bureaucrats in our education system and reducing the number of politicians. That's what's in Bill 104, that's what we presented to this Legislature and that's a bill I'm very proud of, and so are my colleagues.

Mr McGuinty: I'm not the guy who said I could find another \$1 billion inside Ontario's education budget; I didn't say that. This minister against education said that, and that's what we're very much afraid of.

It's telling that the Premier described his dictatorial approach to Bill 26 as one of his biggest mistakes, and yet here we go again this week clearly with both the megacity and education bills. They're not listening. They're ignoring everything they've been told to date.

Maybe on a personal note, Minister, we ought to congratulate you because you are in effect about to create a very real crisis in Ontario's public system of education.

This government likes to talk about reinvestment, so I want to know — I'm going to give you a chance here: As you go about cutting as much as \$1.5 billion from our schools, will you commit today to reinvest every single penny back into the classroom?

Hon Mr Snobelen: I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the opportunity to say this: You are the guy who said about amalgamation: "We have an obligation to consider it. We can't back away from the prospects of amalgamation. As Liberals we're fiscally responsible. We've got to look at that."

On another quote, you are the guy who said, "I think there's generally fairly broad support for reduction in school boards." You're the guy who said that. If you want to talk about credibility in this chamber, this government is acting on its intentions and acting on its promises to the people of Ontario, unlike our friends across the floor.

1430

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My question is for the minister responsible for municipal affairs. I've spent much of the last three weeks meeting with municipal councillors, mayors and reeves across this province who are all very concerned about your downloading of health care, social services and social housing on to municipal property taxes. The download in just eight

communities comes to over \$1 billion. That's \$1 billion that property taxpayers have to pick up. That doesn't include the downloading on the other 800 municipalities; just eight account for \$1 billion.

Minister, even your friends in municipal government don't believe you any more. People don't want to pay higher property taxes so you can give your wealthy friends an income tax cut. Will you admit you were wrong? Will you withdraw your proposal to dump the costs of health care, social services and housing on to the backs of local taxpayers?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): The leader of the third party might want to recall why we're having to do this: because of the mess that party over there got this government in. He might want to recall taking the debt to \$100 billion. He might want to recall having \$9 billion being made in interest payments. Then he wonders why this government had to come in and make some tough decisions to get this province's economy back on its feet. He might just want to reflect on that for a few minutes.

Mr Hampton: I'll reflect on somebody who used to be the commissioner of the Toronto Transit Commission and who used to come to a government I was a part of begging for money all the time. I remember you all too well, sir. I remember you all too well coming begging for money. So don't lecture us as you —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order. Government members, would you come to order, please.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Hold on, hold on.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Member for Etobicoke-Humber. Thank you. Leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: Everyone in this province knows this government is cutting health care and education and community services to find in excess of \$5 billion to finance its tax scheme. That's what's really driving all this.

I want to ask the minister about his related megacity project, which is also in a shambles. You're still trying to tell people that despite the fact 76% of them voted against your bill they don't matter. You're still so incredibly arrogant that you believe you can simply ignore the public will. People are still quite opposed to your bill. They see your amendments as merely shuffling the deck chairs on the Titanic, nothing more. You still haven't addressed their issues. Will you finally withdraw Bill 103 and sit down and talk with people in the greater Toronto area about the real issues that confront them?

Hon Mr Leach: We did listen, we did talk. We had 600 delegates come to the committee to present their views and opinions as to what they wanted to see happen with a single, unified city. We also attended a number of public meetings to make sure we heard all of the voices of the people of Metropolitan Toronto present their views.

We have listened. We have made substantial amendments to the bill. As I said, we have achieved the best of both worlds. We will have a great unified, single city while still respecting the communities and neighbourhoods that people are so fond of and so proud of. Every-

thing that we've done with the amendments to Bill 103 will address the concerns of those who came forward and presented.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): Minister, you didn't listen. You didn't listen, because people did not have concerns just about the trustees or just about the other draconian powers and activities that you have in Bill 103. They were against the single, unified city. That's the key message you've ignored.

Since you persist in proceeding with this bill and with these amendments, will you at least show some little respect for what people said to you in the referendum and not proceed at this stage with the amendments that you filed and at least reconvene the committee and let us have a fuller discussion, something which you prevented us from doing by failing to submit the amendments to the committee as normally would have been the case? Will you at least show that little gesture that will respect, at least in a very minimal part, if you're not prepared to withdraw the bill, the sense of frustration that's out there and the sense that leads people to call your government the arrogant government that it has become? Will you at least do that, Minister?

Hon Mr Leach: Again, one of the reasons the amendments weren't tabled at committee was so that we could reflect on the results of the vote that had taken place, listen to what people had to say, and review the tapes and the data that had been presented at committee to fully understand what their concerns were.

They were concerned about the powers of the trustees; we've addressed that. They were concerned about the transition team; we addressed that. They were concerned about representation, whether 44 was too few; we addressed that. They were concerned about neighbourhoods, they were concerned about communities and they were concerned about municipal boundaries; we addressed that. All of the concerns that were put forward by the people of Metropolitan Toronto were listened to and are addressed in the amendments that we're bringing forward. We will have a unified city. We will have strong municipal commitment. We will have strong community commitment. That's what the people of this great city wanted.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): My next question is for the Minister of Health. We have learned of a shocking practice that is now happening in Ontario hospitals. Many hospitals now require palliative care patients to pay a daily fee. Palliative care is for people who are dying, people who have a terminal illness. Palliative care helps them control the pain and deal with the disease symptoms. Can the Minister of Health tell us why his government has set up a system where people who are dying have to pay a daily user fee in order to receive hospital care?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): For many years — it began under the Liberal government — long-term patients in our hospitals have paid a copayment. There's nothing new in that. In the palliative care stage, if they've been in a chronic facility for a great period of

time, those copayments continue in most cases at the discretion of the hospital. That policy has not changed. It's been in place for many, many years.

Mr Hampton: Oh, something really has changed. This is the minister who under Bill 26 introduced a regulation to allow hospitals to charge patients in chronic care beds a daily fee, and this is the Minister of Health who has presided over a system where even your own hospital restructuring commission said in its Toronto report, "Currently, the ministry has no policy for determining the location of and planning benchmarks for hospital-based palliative care beds."

Because you have no system in place, what's happening is that hospitals are using that chronic care user fee, that user fee that is attached to a chronic care bed, to force palliative care patients to pay a daily user fee. That's the reality of what's happening, and it's happening because you've cut \$800 million from their budgets and they're scrambling for money and they're making use of the scenario you created. When are you going to do something to correct —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.
1440

Hon Mr Wilson: Because there is discretion in the system, I would appreciate it if the honourable member would give me the specific case of the hospital or hospitals he's referring to and I'd be happy, as I always am in response to members' questions, to immediately look into that to make sure the policy is not being abused in some way.

Second, no one on the face of the earth spends more on health care per person than Ontario today. The honourable member is in error. The health care budget is up significantly and it continues to grow. For once the NDP should acknowledge that revenues are up because of the tax cut. You left us with a huge deficit in the province. We've had to close about 14 ministries. There are fewer ministers and there's less of everything on this side of the House, and every penny and more has gone into an increased health care budget.

Why don't you just admit some facts for a change rather than flying off the cuff and using all the rhetoric that you use? The health care budget is up. It's never been stronger in this province. We're correcting a lot of problems of the last 10 years that your government and the Liberal government failed to address.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): You tried to shove that one. That didn't go anywhere.

The Speaker: I caution the member for Windsor-Sandwich, I hear you much clearer now. I guess it's from a few rows up. You must come to order. The Minister of Health has the floor. It's important I hear him as well.

Supplementary.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): Minister, you, and you alone, are responsible for the chaos that faces palliative care patients and their caregivers and their families. You want to know where? We can tell you because our colleague Peter Kormos uncovered the fact that this fee is being charged by Douglas Memorial Hospital, the Greater Niagara General, Port Colborne General, St Catharines General, Welland hospital, West Lincoln and Shaver Hospital. We're doing our work

today, through the palliative care information centre, to find out where in Metro Toronto they charge it, because we know they do.

You're responsible. You have no plan for palliative care beds in hospitals, yet you're closing chronic care beds which often take on these patients. You're allowing hospitals to charge for those chronic care beds whether or not the patient in that bed is palliative. You and your commission have yet to present a coherent plan for long-term care which ensures that dying patients, who are either forced out of hospitals by this fee or who choose to die at home, have the level of care and support they and their families require. The need for palliative care is growing. When are you going to present an effective and comprehensive plan to deal with this very vulnerable population?

Hon Mr Wilson: Clearly the NDP's past has come back to haunt them. Mr Jackson and I recall being on that side of the House when you delisted long-term care from OHIP services, one of the 19 services you took out of OHIP and out of the Canada Health Act. So if there's a correction to be made here, this government once again would be happy to make the correction on behalf of seniors and on behalf of people who need palliative care. But we didn't delist long-term care; you delisted long-term care, and the chickens are coming back to roost. Once again, we'd be happy to fix the situation.

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question is to the Minister of Finance and it has to do with the situation on Bre-X. As everybody knows, thousands of individuals have lost literally millions of dollars on this. The Ontario Securities Commission, as you know, reports to you. Their mission is to protect investors from unfair, improper or fraudulent practices and to foster fair and efficient capital markets and confidence in their integrity, an important role. Bre-X certainly, I think it's fair to say, has shattered a lot of confidence. My question is this: When did the Ontario Securities Commission become aware of the problem, what steps did it take and when did they inform you of the problem?

Hon Ernie L. Eves (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): I'm sure the honourable member is aware that the Ontario Securities Commission is an independent agency that operates on its own.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Oh.

Hon Mr Eves: I hear the member for St Catharines saying, "Oh." Everybody in this province can certainly be proud that we do have an institution like the Ontario Securities Commission there protecting investors. It has a worldwide reputation as being one of the most vigilant securities commissions not only in Canada but indeed in all of North America.

They are an independent body, and I think it is very important that they remain such. They make their own decisions. They have very tough standards and they have set an example for the rest of the country to the point where, of course, we have other provinces and indeed the federal government talking about creating a national

securities commission with its base here in Toronto, Ontario.

Mr Phillips: I had hoped the minister might provide some assurance for the public. The minister will know that on July 26 the commission sent its annual report to you, signalling its concerns about the budget that you've set for them, indicating that, as they say here: "During the past several years, it has operated with a high vacancy rate, due to budget constraints." It pointed out that they must be assured of adequate funding and managerial authority to discharge their mandate. "Failure to do so will severely erode the likelihood of successful outcomes."

Minister, I was trying to give you an opportunity to reassure the public, who are concerned out there right now, and to say that it is an arm's-length agency, I think you are failing to inform the public that it is the Ministry of Finance that sets their budget. They have indicated concerns, and my question is, and it's important for you to reassure the markets, does the Ontario Securities Commission have adequate resources to allow them to effectively carry out their responsibility?

Hon Mr Eves: Absolutely is the answer to that question. The member would probably also know — if he didn't know this, he should have known this — that I visited the Ontario Securities Commission last November and I made a commitment to the commission that in this coming fiscal year they will have between \$3 million and \$5 million added to their budget.

I made a commitment to them that over a period of a very short number of years they will become a fully self-funded operating agency in the province. I've also asked for the commission to report back to me with recommendations that they would make to the government to make them a totally independent, fully funded, self-funded, self-regulated commission.

I don't know why the honourable member chose not to mention any of that in his questions, and I think he is not doing the Ontario public any good, nor the Toronto Stock Exchange, nor the Ontario Securities Commission, to even begin to hint that Bre-X's problems are as a result of some sort —

The Speaker: New question, third party, member for Algoma.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a question for the Minister of Education and Training. The minister will know that executive members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Ontario division, are occupying the minister's office today. They are doing this because of their concern that under Bill 104 the government intends to remove successor rights and override collective agreements, to make it possible for private companies to take over the jobs of the people who care for and clean and maintain our schools or work in school offices and provide special services to children.

Last week in the committee the government members refused to support our amendment to delete the section of Bill 104 which would require the proposed Education Improvement Commission to promote contracting out of

these jobs. Instead the government members watered down the wording. However, the government is still singling out non-teaching staff in its effort to take \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion out of our education system.

Why is the government keeping, in Bill 104, the instruction to the Education Improvement Commission —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Minister of Education.

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): I want to thank the member for clarifying for me today why it is that Sid Ryan and some associates might be in my office today. I was a little confused about it. We don't have an appointment, although I'm more than happy to make one and to have a meeting with those folks at any time. Unfortunately, there is no meeting and also they have chosen to be at my office on a day when I'm scheduled not to be there. I was a little confused about that. Given that the member opposite seems to know more about it than I do, I am pleased he brought that information forward today.

The reason my colleagues and I made an amendment to Bill 104 was to meet those very concerns he's speaking of, to make sure the language reflected our intentions. Let's be very clear about it: Our intentions are to have a first-quality education for every student in Ontario and to deliver that at a cost that represents a real value for the taxpayers of Ontario — quality and value. My colleagues and I believe that's what we should be doing and that's what we are doing.

1450

Mr Wildman: During the committee hearings we heard from all kinds of people — school boards, trustees, teachers, parents, students — about the downsizing and contracting out of these jobs. As a matter of fact we heard from Ernie Parsons, the chair of the Hastings County Board of Education, who told the committee: "Good things happen in our schools because of our non-teaching staff. I'm asking you to please allow us to locally recognize their dedication and continue to employ our current staff."

The member for Durham East has decided to introduce a private member's resolution. Flawed as it may be, it would ensure that the current employees, if there is contracting out, have the right to bid on those contracts. While I think that resolution doesn't go far enough, I'm asking the minister today if he will be in the House on Thursday to support the private member's resolution introduced by his colleague from Durham East.

Hon Mr Snobelen: It gives me a great deal of pleasure to inform the member opposite that my colleague from Durham East is concerned about making sure that the people in our education system are dealt with professionally and with compassion and empathy if in fact some reductions are necessary, so obviously all my colleagues lean that way and are inclined to be concerned about those sorts of things, including myself.

There were a large number of people heard from as the committee travelled on Bill 104. A lot of concerns were heard from people who represented various unions and other groups, but there were also people who talked about improvements that could be made in the system of education. We heard the people from the Ottawa-Carleton

French Catholic board, who have made extraordinary gains in the quality of their education system while being able to provide that with lower costs to their taxpayers. That's the sort of thing we believe all the people of Ontario should be able to benefit from and Bill 104 will allow us to take those steps forward, in quality, in effectiveness and in real value for our education system.

LIGHTING UP ONTARIO

Ms Isabel Bassett (St Andrew-St Patrick): My question is for the Minister of Environment and Energy. Ontario Hydro, I understand, has a new initiative for sponsorship called Lighting Up the Theatres of Ontario. The Tarragon Theatre in my riding of St Andrew-St Patrick has been lucky enough to be chosen for this initiative and I wonder if you could tell us something about the value of this program to the theatres and to Ontario.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): Ontario Hydro recognizes the importance of the performing arts organizations in our economy and our communities. As well, Ontario Hydro is aware of the pressures on many of these non-profit organizations. At the same time, we are seeing exciting new innovations with regard to performance lighting in these theatres, regarding both quality and energy efficiency. That is why Ontario Hydro created this program initiative, which is a matching grant program designed to cover between one third and two thirds of the cost of upgrading lighting systems at professional community-based and non-profit theatre organizations across Ontario.

Ms Bassett: The Tarragon Theatre of course is lucky to have been part of this initiative. By the way, since I have everybody's attention, they have the highly acclaimed show *The Glass Menagerie* there now that you can all go to. With the new Lighting Up Ontario, could you tell me what you need to do to participate in this program. Can other theatres get involved? What selection criteria did you use for the theatres you chose so that other theatres perhaps could line up and be part of it?

Hon Mr Sterling: Last year Ontario Hydro invited theatres from across Ontario to apply to this program and they had 43 applications. They also asked the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, the Canadian Centre for Business in the Community and the Council for Business and the Arts in Canada to look at all these applications and come up with those that would qualify the best. Twenty theatres were chosen: 13 this year and seven next. I'm pleased that the member for St Andrew-St Patrick was the recipient of one of the benefits of this particular program.

I believe Ontario Hydro, through its program, will be able to support Ontario's vibrant theatre industry and improve energy efficiency at the same time.

CHILD WELFARE

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. You've been the minister since last year and since that time we've had the death of a child who was in the care of the government of Ontario. Since that time

the Ontario children's aid societies chose to do an investigation into why deaths of children under your watch were so alarmingly high. Minister, I'd like you to tell the House today, since last year, since you've been the minister, what have you done to address this issue?

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Community and Social Services): Anybody who has ever been in the Ministry of Community and Social Services unfortunately gets to see some very tragic circumstances whenever a child dies, either in the care of their family or in the care of a children's aid society. No matter how good we think our systems are, they have to be better, because we do not want any child to be harmed or to die in any circumstance like this.

That's one of the reasons why the ministry has been so pleased to participate with the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies and the coroner's office in the task force that is taking a look at some of the child deaths that have occurred in the past, to find out if there are common links and to make recommendations as to what we can do to improve the support for those child welfare workers who are making those very difficult decisions.

Mrs Pupatello: It's very strange, because no one else thinks you participated in this study, but since you have announced today that you participated in this task force, it only stands to reason that you are going to implement the recommendations of your task force. In fact, when journalists asked you last week about your response, you didn't say how concerned you were about tragic events. You said, "It's bad judgement by the front-line workers." You took the opportunity to blame the staff at the front line for the deaths of children under your watch.

Minister, if you are admitting today that this is your task force, in fact it is your report, will you then confirm that you will be instituting all the recommendations of your report?

Hon Mrs Ecker: With all due respect to the honourable member, I really wish she would check her facts. I did not blame child welfare workers out there who are making extremely difficult decisions. What they need from the government, what they need from the opposition is better support. The Toronto Sun article did not quote me, and if you'd listened to Metro Morning, if you'd listened to CBC, if you'd listened to CFTO, you would know exactly what I said about the child welfare workers. They need support, Madam Member over there; they do not need politics from you.

1500

IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a question of the Attorney General and minister responsible for native affairs with regard to the meeting notes dated September 5 of the interministerial committee, which are now public and which indicate that this government played a significant role in the events that led to the fatal shooting of Dudley George at Ipperwash. Although the meeting notes make it clear that there had not been any discussions with the Stoney Pointers by MNR or the OPP and it wasn't clear what their demands might be, although they were

noted to be non-violent, they indicate that neither the government nor the OPP attempted to communicate with the occupiers of Ipperwash park, preceding the major police buildup and the shift in the role the police played from previous incidents which were ended peacefully. It states, "The province will take steps to remove the occupiers ASAP." Is that why the OPP suddenly changed their long-standing historical approach in dealing with these disputes?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): It's quite clear that the actions of the province were to take the steps to obtain a civil injunction, and that is exactly what the province did. The province took those steps and I believe appeared in court on September 7 to obtain a civil injunction. What the police did were simply matters that were left to the police. Commissioner O'Grady made it very clear that there was no political interference. Police made decisions, they made those decisions on their own and Commissioner O'Grady certainly confirmed that was the case.

Mr Wildman: It says clearly on page 3, under the heading "Next Steps," "The province will take steps to remove the occupiers ASAP. The OPP will have the discretion as to how to proceed with removing the Stoney Pointers from the park" — not whether to proceed, but how to proceed ASAP. The Premier stated on May 29, 1996, "There was absolutely no direction, as there ought not to be, from me or any of my staff to the OPP."

We now know that it's not true that this government didn't give any direction. As a matter of fact, it's right here in the notes that the OPP should proceed. That direction led to the fatal shooting of a man named Dudley George. Only a public inquiry can have the broad powers to deal with the chain of command to determine who made the decisions all the way up from the OPP in the field to the Premier's office. Will the minister now agree that this government must call a public inquiry as soon as possible into the events that led to the shooting of Dudley George?

Hon Mr Harnick: As I indicated and as has been confirmed by Commissioner O'Grady, the OPP had the discretion to deal with this matter as they normally would have had the discretion and indeed had the discretion in this case. There was no political interference; there was no political direction. The decision that was made on a political basis was to take a decision and direct that a civil injunction be prepared and proceeded with, and that is exactly what happened.

FARM RETAIL SALES TAX REBATES

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. In last year's budget, in addition to cutting income taxes and cutting employer health tax, the government also demonstrated its commitment to the Ontario agricultural industry by announcing it would rebate the Ontario retail sales tax for commercial construction on farms throughout the province of Ontario. In doing so, it recognized the very central role that agriculture continues to play in the Ontario economy.

Last week, the minister made an important announcement at CalMar Farms in my constituency of Nepean.

Could the minister explain to the House how the retail sales tax rebate program for commercial farmers will boost economic growth and job creation in the agricultural communities across Ontario?

Hon Noble Villeneuve (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs): Yes, this confirms the commitment that this government has to the food producers of this province. By rebating 8% retail sales tax on capital construction, it will give the farmers of this province the opportunity of being more efficient and to control their own destiny.

It will also give the construction industry a boost and will certainly bring a lot of real good, solid thinking through to the farmers of Ontario, that their government is 110% behind them. It recognizes the importance of this industry, second only to the car industry, and that we will be exporting from this province upwards of \$10 billion by the turn of the century. Yes, the sales tax rebate is of utmost importance and it is a clear signal to Ontario's food producers that their government is with them.

Mr Baird: I know this program has been a real incentive to construction on farms in my riding and throughout Carleton county. New construction means new jobs and a strong agricultural industry means a strong Ontario economy. I understand that a considerable amount of money remains left in the fund. Could the minister update the House on the specific success to date of the program and on the anticipated demand for this program in the coming year?

Hon Mr Villeneuve: According to the latest statistics I have, the province has rebated about 1,000 applications for the sales tax, well over \$2 million. There are 400 applications on file right now and, as you would all know, farmers are presently in the process of completing their income tax returns for last year and we expect a real rush of applications for rebate of the sales tax.

Certainly, by giving farmers time to plan — we gave them more time this year because it was last Thursday that the extension was announced — it gives them time to plan and make the arrangements before their very busy time of the year, which is next month, and we anticipate that this will indeed be a very productive and positive move in the area of food production.

AGRICULTURAL FUNDING

Mr Pat Hoy (Essex-Kent): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. For almost two years now I have been urging you to keep your promise of no cuts to agriculture and you have accused me of fearmongering. Now a group of 36 Ontario farm organizations has banded together for the express purpose of opposing your government's cuts.

I have worked in agriculture all of my life and this is the first time I've seen this many groups united on a single issue. They are telling you that agriculture must not be cut further. It is your duty to send the message to your cabinet colleagues as you prepare for the provincial budget. Will you stand in your place today and give 110% and tell this House that you will not tolerate any further attacks on the agricultural budget?

Hon Noble Villeneuve (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs): I thank my colleague across the way for the question. Of course, he didn't mention that we just extended the provincial sales tax rebate, which will be another \$20 million, and the Grow Ontario program, another \$15 million. Those two parties promised to correct the farm tax rebate. I am proud to say that this government has corrected a serious inequity: yes, \$171 million that farmers no longer have to pay and then wait for a rebate.

The Liberal government brought that in, in smoke and mirrors, back in the late 1980s, and tried to make it look like the Ministry of Agriculture's budget had gone up by well over \$100 million, when what happened? It went from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs across the street to 801 Bay Street.

I am pleased to tell you that I met with the 36 representatives of the Ontario agrifood industry, listened to them, and I can tell you that they are quite happy with what —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Supplementary.

Mr Hoy: I don't believe that the farm organizations are that happy and you can't reannounce program after program and make it like you're doubling the money. It's \$20 million and it's a one-time deal.

In at least one township I know of the council is granting up to 80 severances from farm land at a time. The mayor said that this is the only way they can make up for the provincial downloading. He says, "I know we're bending the rules a little, but what can we do?"

Your government is causing this and gives only vague suggestions as to how municipalities may be eligible to receive some funding through your limited restructuring funds, and that's not satisfactory. Will you commit to returning the funding dollar for dollar so that the municipalities do not have to pay for the dumped programs on the backs of rural Ontarians?

1510

Hon Mr Villeneuve: I'm not sure if the honourable member was at the ROMA convention, but I was very pleased at the Rural Ontario Municipal Association convention to tell them there's a \$1-billion community reinvestment fund, a \$1-billion renewal annually, along with a \$1.5-billion special account for capital projects, operating and social services.

It's indeed somewhat frustrating when the honourable member attempts to try to belittle the fact that there will be a \$1-billion renewal fund to assist not only in the moneys that will be taken away from rural municipalities but indeed to look after municipalities.

We have taken away \$5.4 billion of educational costs from the tax bill —

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

HIGHWAY FINANCING

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Today, April 1, marks the day on which the province of Ontario is handing down to the municipalities across this province some 1,776 kilometres of highways. Municipalities across this

province are upset. In Timmins they're so upset they've taken matters into their own hands. They've tried to meet with ministry officials in order to say that this is a bad deal for the residents of the city of Timmins, as it is across the province, and to no avail; you, the minister, and your ministry have not responded to the concerns of the city of Timmins, as with every other community across this province. In fact, the city of Timmins had to erect signs on the highways this morning in and around the city of Timmins. I want to send you a copy. It says that Highway 101 —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order, the member for Cochrane South. I appreciate it, but that is in fact a prop. Minister of Transportation.

Hon Al Palladini (Minister of Transportation): These past two years this government was saying all along that highways that no longer serve a purpose are going to be transferred to municipalities. I'd add that this is not an invention of the Harris government; as long as I can remember, this has been ongoing.

I want to reiterate that these transfers are going to be taking place with compensation attached to them, or the roads are going to be in the best condition they could possibly be. We are delivering those highways to municipalities that are serving strictly a municipal purpose.

Mr Bisson: To the Minister of Transportation, I really succinctly want to put to you that the highways you're transferring over —

Interjection.

The Speaker: It's his time you're wasting, member for Fort York.

Mr Bisson: The highways you're transferring over to the municipality of Timmins, like you are to all other municipalities, are not only municipal in significance; they are provincial highways. The municipalities don't have the money to be able to pay for them. In the city of Timmins, it means an extra \$400,000 they've got to find from the municipal tax base to pay for these particular highways.

Minister, I ask you once again, will you please stop this download on to the municipalities of the province of Ontario and stop this attack on the taxpayers and keep the highways where they belong: with the province?

Hon Mr Palladini: We are not attacking any municipality. I'm just going to reiterate the same thing, that these highways that are being transferred no longer serve a provincial purpose; they are a municipal road.

Speaking of funding, if a municipality happens to be in the position that it supposedly can't afford to keep funding this highway, we have a \$1-billion restructuring fund that municipalities can draw from. We are not doing things that shouldn't be done. As a matter of fact, we are doing what should be done in the best interests of all Ontarians.

LAND TRANSFER TAX REBATE

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): My question is for the Minister of Finance. New home buyers are very pleased to learn that you've extended the program which refunds up to \$1,725 of the land transfer tax for the first-time buyers on newly constructed homes.

A home is the biggest purchase most of us make in our lives, and with the costs of real estate closing, moving and new appliances, a tax rebate of this size is very helpful. According to home builders, many first-time purchasers say the land transfer tax refund was the incentive they needed to buy a new home. In my city of Mississauga 3,478 households purchased new homes during the first 11 months of this program. Our city is very proud of its new neighbourhoods and its infill housing. Minister, what has been the impact of the land transfer tax refund on housing affordability in Ontario?

Hon Ernie L. Eves (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): The response to the land transfer tax rebate program announced in the budget last year was tremendous. Over 11,000 first-time home buyers in Ontario have taken advantage of this program. That amounts to over \$13.5 million given to young families making a start in life. The amount they have saved from this program, the maximum being \$1,725, could account for 17% of their downpayment or a major purchase of appliances such as five appliances. There's been a tremendous response to the program and that's why we decided to extend it for another year.

Mrs Marland: One of the biggest advantages of the land transfer tax rebate program is the boost it gives to employment in the construction industry and the retail sector. Minister, do you have any information on the economic growth and job creation that have resulted from this program and from other new policies of our government?

Hon Mr Eves: The construction of one single new home creates 2.8 years of employment in Ontario. In the province last year new housing starts were up 20.2%. In February alone, new home sales in Toronto were up 44.7% and up almost 60% — 59.6% — for the 1996 calendar year. Since August 1996 Ontario has led the way in construction jobs created in Canada. There have been 34,000 construction jobs created in Canada since August 1996, with 29,000 of them here in Ontario. I think members can readily see the tremendous economic impact this policy in housing starts has had in the province. We are leading the way in Canada with respect to housing starts and construction jobs and we will continue to do so in the future.

SERVICES FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Minister, I need to ask you once again about Veronica Manuel, a constituent of mine who is desperately trying to keep her severely disabled son Dylan at home. You will recall that Veronica appeared before the standing committee on social development a couple of months ago to tell her story, a story that shocked and upset all members of the committee, including the government members, a story of how the actions of this government have left her physically and financially exhausted and how her full-time job looking after Dylan has not been acknowledged by this government.

You've told me personally that you're very moved by the circumstances of Ms Manuel's case, yet neither you

nor your officials have responded to her many letters, phone calls and pleas since her appearance before the committee. I have one more letter from Ms Manuel which I'd like to have a page deliver to you today. I'd like to ask you, and then I won't get a supplementary, two questions, if I can. Do you not think Ms Manuel, as a full-time caregiver, deserves a response from you and do you not think it is time that caregiver status should be acknowledged by your government and by yourself?

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Community and Social Services): To the honourable member, yes, for this particular individual the situation is quite tragic. We do recognize the financial and personal sacrifice parents are making to care for disabled children at home. It's one of the reasons we increased the spending on the special services at home program. Yes, we have gotten back to this particular individual to try and help solve the case. I'd be quite pleased to accept this recent letter and to see what more we can do to try and help this woman.

1520

PETITIONS

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): I have a petition from over 500 organizations and women and it reads as follows:

"Women's declaration against the amalgamation and for local democracy:

"We, the undersigned women from all of Metro Toronto, demand that (1) the Ontario government cease all proceedings on Bill 103, the City of Toronto Act, and recall its trustees; (2) withdraw all proposals to download costs of welfare, health and assisted housing.

"Because women work to create services that benefit our communities such as child care, recreation centres, settlement houses, health and safety programs and public education;

"Because we believe our communities are stronger when people care for those in need, regardless of their place of origin, and that all residents of Ontario should share this responsibility to care;

"Because women are as a group more dependent on community and social services, it is women who will suffer most from their loss;

"Because the added financial burden on municipalities will jeopardize existing and future services which women need: housing for low-income people; long-term care for the elderly; child care; public health services; environmental sustainability projects; projects to prevent violence; safe, affordable, convenient and dependable transit; employment equity programs; public education for the diverse needs of our community; urban design and planning policies which make our communities safer and more livable;

"Because local community institutions foster the participation and leadership of women in government;

"Because women fought for the right to vote and make decisions about our lives;

"Because there is no equality when others make important decisions for us;

"We therefore urge all women to: (1) oppose this amalgamation; (2) sign this declaration; (3) vote No."

I'm very pleased to add my signature.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I too have a petition with literally thousands of names, signed by women across the province. It reads:

"Women's declaration against amalgamation and for local democracy:

"We, the undersigned women from all of Metro Toronto, demand that the Ontario government (1) cease all proceedings on Bill 103, the City of Toronto Act, and recall its trustees; (2) withdraw all proposals to download costs of welfare, health and assisted housing.

"Because women work to create services that benefit our community such as child care, recreation centres, settlement houses, health and safety programs, and good public education;

"Because we believe our communities are better when people care for those in need, regardless of their place of origin, and that all residents of Ontario should share this responsibility to care;

"Because women are as a group more dependent on community and social services, it is women who will suffer most from their loss;

"Because the added financial burden on municipalities will jeopardize existing and future services which women need: housing for low-income people; long-term care for the elderly; child care; public health services; environmental sustainability projects; programs to prevent violence; safe, affordable, convenient and dependable transit; employment equity programs; public education for the diverse needs of our community; urban design and planning policies which make our communities safer and more livable;

"Because local community institutions foster the participation and leadership of women in government;

"Because women fought for the right to vote and make decisions about our lives;

"Because there is no equality when others make important decisions for us;

"We therefore urge all women to (1) oppose this amalgamation; (2) sign this declaration; (3) vote No in local referendums."

This declaration is sponsored by the Women's Coalition for Local Democracy, including the City of Toronto Committee on the Status of Women, Women Plan Toronto and Older Women's Network. I sign my signature to this petition because I fully support it.

GEORGIAN WOOD ADDICTION CENTRE

Mr Allan K. McLean (Simcoe East): I have a petition that says:

"We, the undersigned, urge the government of the province of Ontario to heed the advice of the citizens, elected officials and planning bodies of our area and continue funding the Georgian Wood Addiction Centre as a multifunctional rural addiction treatment centre with a short-term residential program, and to continue its divestment to the North Simcoe Hospital Alliance, and to continue to work cooperatively with the new integrated service delivery system for this end of the centre region in north Simcoe."

This is from Orillia, Penetanguishene, Midland and Stayner and areas in north Simcoe, and I've signed my name to it.

ROUTE 17

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Prescott et Russell) : À l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

«Attendu que des accidents surviennent sur une base régulière et qu'un rapport de la PPO de Rockland démontre que 23 accidents sérieux sont survenus au cours des huit derniers mois sur la route 17 entre Rockland et Orléans ;

«Attendu qu'une étude démontre que pas moins de 18 000 voitures circulent chaque jour sur cette portion de 20 kilomètres de la route 17 ;

«Attendu que la conception d'ébauches est complétée, des audiences publiques ont eu lieu et des parcelles de terrain ont été achetées ;

«Nous, soussignés, adressons à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario la pétition suivante :

«Nous demandons au ministre des Transports, Al Palladini, de remettre sur sa liste de priorités le projet d'élargissement de la route 17 entre le chemin Trim et Clarence Point et nous demandons au gouvernement de mettre de côté les fonds nécessaires pour l'exécution de ce projet avant de remettre aux municipalités la responsabilité de la route 17.»

J'y ajoute ma signature.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): I have a petition signed by thousands of residents of places like Hornepayne, Wawa, Blind River, Parry Sound and Metropolitan Toronto opposing the restructuring that is being proposed by this government and Bill 104, specifically the lack of local autonomy and local accountability and accessibility and the downloading to municipal taxpayers, as well as the contracting out of jobs for non-instructional staff. I support the petition and sign my name to it.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Ms Isabel Bassett (St Andrew-St Patrick): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario signed by 1,890 people from across Toronto:

"Whereas the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto have overwhelmingly voted against the amalgamation of the six municipalities into a megacity,

"We, the undersigned, call on the government to withdraw Bill 103 and stop plans to create a megacity."

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): I have a petition against the megacity madness of this government. On top of this petition there is a big headline which says, "Stop the Megacity Madness." It's addressed to the Ontario Legislature. It reads:

"Whereas 'bigger government is not better' and the Mike Harris government has no right to dictate a megacity upon the citizens of Metro Toronto;

"Whereas the megacity is being imposed on 2.3 million citizens in Metro Toronto without giving people a voice in the future of their cities and neighbourhoods;

"Whereas a megacity could lead to mega property tax increases, mega user fees and mega cuts in services; and

"Whereas the Tories never proposed abolishing local government in favour of bigger government during the election campaign,

"We, therefore, the undersigned residents of Ontario and Toronto, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To give the 2.3 million people in Metro Toronto a say in the future of their cities and stop the imposition of a megacity."

Since I agree with the sentiments, I'm putting my signature on the bottom.

PREMIER OF ONTARIO

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): I've got a petition here from the Ontario Omnibus Alliance. There are 2,000 names. It reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the registered voters of the province of Ontario, expect the government we elect to lead our Legislature in a responsible and competent manner; and

"Whereas we expect the government we elect to be the government of all the people and to consult with the opposition and to respect the mandate given the government by the electorate; and

"Whereas the present government, led by Premier Mike Harris, has forced the passage of important legislation without adequate preparation, consultation and debate, and has exceeded the mandate given the government by the electorate, and has passed legislation, including Bill 26, that increases the power of the government to unduly intrude into the lives of the people and contradicts the values that define us as a compassionate, inclusive and just society, and has caused us to become more divided at a time when we should be overlooking our differences and coming together to find new ways of protecting and nurturing those values to which we all aspire; and

"Whereas we, the registered voters of the province of Ontario, for the reasons given above have lost all confidence in the leadership of Mike Harris;

"Then be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of the province of Ontario to remove Mike Harris from the position of Premier by whatever legal means, including his voluntary resignation, and to replace him at the earliest possible moment with a competent and responsible member of the provincial Parliament."

I affix my signature to that.

1530

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr Dave Boushy (Sarnia): I have a petition in regard to Bill 104.

"Whereas Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, is a threat to our education system;

"Whereas the Education Improvement Commission has far-reaching and unprecedented powers;

"Whereas outsourcing of non-instructional jobs such as school secretaries, custodians, library technicians and

educational assistants will result in chaos and poor service and limited savings, if any;

"We therefore petition the Legislative Assembly to repeal Bill 104, to limit the powers of the Education Improvement Commission and to guarantee successor rights for non-instructional jobs."

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Frank Mclash (Kenora): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads:

"Whereas the government of Ontario is proposing to restructure completely the provincial-municipal relationship without having consulted the people of Ontario; and

"This restructuring proposes to download to municipalities the cost of transportation and such critical social services as welfare and long-term care for the elderly and the chronically ill; and

"Removes school boards' ability to tax, eliminating any effective local control over schools and school programs; and

"The government's actions fail to guarantee existing levels of funding and fail to recognize the unequal ability of local communities to bear the cost of these new burdens, thus producing inequitable access to essential services; and

"Whereas the government's lack of meaningful public consultation and disregard for public response pose a serious threat to democracy;

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, because we care about the quality of life in our province and the wellbeing of our children, neighbours and communities, register a vote of non-confidence to the government in the province of Ontario."

That's signed by many people throughout the riding of Kenora, and I too have attached my signature to that petition.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We oppose the provisions provided for in Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, in which the Education Improvement Commission, which is an appointed, not an elected body, will conduct research, facilitate discussion and make recommendations to the Minister of Education on how to promote and facilitate the outsourcing of non-instructional services by district school boards.

"Bill 104 will adversely affect the quality of consistent support presently available to students in our schools. Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, in its present form is not acceptable to the citizens of Ontario."

This is signed by over 3,000 citizens from London and area, and I am proud to affix my signature.

GOVERNMENT AGENDA

Mr Bob Wood (London South): I'd like to present a petition to the Legislature signed by a number of people in the London area expressing a lack of confidence in the government.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the government of Ontario is proposing to restructure completely the provincial-municipal relationship without having consulted the people of Ontario; and

"This restructuring proposes to download to municipalities the cost of transportation and such critical social services as welfare and long-term care for the elderly and the chronically ill; and

"Removes school boards' ability to tax, eliminating any effective local control over schools and school programs; and

"The government's actions fail to guarantee existing levels of funding and fail to recognize the unequal ability of local communities to bear the cost of these new burdens, thus producing inequitable access to essential services; and

"Whereas the government's lack of meaningful public consultation and disregard for public response pose a serious threat to democracy;

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, because we care about the quality of life in our province and the wellbeing of our children, neighbours and communities, register a vote of non-confidence in the government of the province of Ontario."

It's signed by a great many Ontario citizens as well as constituents in my own riding, and I have affixed my signature in complete agreement.

MACASSA LODGE

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): I have a petition which is signed by 71 residents of the city of Hamilton and it reads as follows:

"We, the residents, friends and supporters of Macassa Lodge, urge and strongly request that the provincial government honour its commitment and reinstate the \$8.5 million as its share towards the final phase of renovations at Macassa Lodge."

As I understand it, our government provided money, and construction occurred at Macassa Lodge. Then this Conservative government, which promised no cuts to health care, indeed cancelled the final phase at a cost of \$8.5 million. The seniors are particularly concerned about this, and I am pleased that Chris Charlton, who is our federal candidate in that area, has gathered the petitions and asked me to present them here. I agree with the petitioners.

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew North): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: On February 19, 1997, in remarks that I made directed to the second reading debate of the police services bill, Bill 105, I referred to the Mr Justice Campbell report of the policing into the Bernardo matter, using some rather intemperate language, I must say, upon reflection. I referred to the Niagara Regional Police in that debate on Wednesday, February 19, 1997, as "that bloody police force." Those remarks, upon reflection, I deem to be inappropriate. I withdraw them and apologize for any upset they might have caused.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on general government and move its adoption.

Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of Legislative Services (Ms Deborah Deller): Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 103, An Act to replace the seven existing municipal governments of Metropolitan Toronto by incorporating a new municipality to be known as the City of Toronto.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated January 29, 1997, the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on social development and move its adoption.

Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of Legislative Services (Ms Deborah Deller): Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 104, An Act to improve the accountability, effectiveness and quality of Ontario's school system by permitting a reduction in the number of school boards, establishing an Education Improvement Commission to oversee the transition to the new system, providing for certain matters related to elections in 1997 and making other improvements to the Education Act and the Municipal Elections Act, 1996.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Shall the report be received and adopted?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated February 6, 1997, the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

OPPOSITION DAY

GOVERNMENT AGENDA

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): This is an opposition day and this is the opposition resolution:

Whereas the Harris Conservative government is refusing to listen to the voices of citizens in East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto and York who have clearly rejected the Harris government's megacity proposal in Bill 103; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government has ignored the concerns expressed by parents and educators about the grab for central control of schools in Bill 104; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government, by appointing trustees to oversee actions of elected municipal councils before final passage of Bill 103, has shown no regard for the role of the Legislative Assembly; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government, by appointing committee vice-chairs with powers over elected school boards before final passage of Bill 104, has shown no regard for the authority of the Legislative Assembly; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government is taking control of schools away from elected local school board members so that it can cut education spending to fund its tax cut scheme; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government, while slashing \$1.3 billion from Ontario hospitals, is ordering hospitals closed before ensuring that community services are in place to meet health care needs; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government is downloading the costs of welfare, long-term care, public health, housing, public transit, libraries, police, child care, ambulance services and other social services to find money to pay for its tax cut scheme;

Whereas the Harris Conservative government, instead of seeking real input for its proposals, has spent millions of taxpayers' dollars on slick advertising campaigns intended to shore up sagging Tory support; and

Whereas the Harris Conservative government set the tone for its bully tactics by passing the anti-worker Bill 7 without a single minute of public hearings, then trying to ram the omnibus Bill 26 through the Legislative Assembly without listening to the province-wide concerns;

Therefore this House calls on the government to withdraw Bill 103 and Bill 104; to make a new start on reforming municipal and education governance in Ontario; to stop cutting base funding of hospitals; to allow communities to determine how to restructure their hospital services and ensure that community services are in place before hospitals are closed; to embrace a process that gives all citizens a chance to have their voices heard; and to reverse the decision to download social service costs on to municipal taxpayers. Premier of Ontario.

To be debated Tuesday, April 1, 1997.

1540

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Mr Hampton moves opposition day number 4:

Whereas the Harris Conservative government is refusing to listen to the voices of citizens in East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto and York who have clearly rejected the Harris government's megacity proposal in Bill 103 —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Dispense.

The Deputy Speaker: The Speaker doesn't have to dispense, but I will dispense. He doesn't have to, but I will dispense.

Mr Hampton: I'm pleased to lead off debate on this opposition day resolution because it's really one of the few opportunities we've had to bring all of these issues

together and bring them together in a way which people across this province can begin to understand.

The government wants to say, for example, on the health care front that it is restructuring health care. The fact of the matter is that it is doing something quite different: It is cutting health care. It has cut \$800 million out of hospital budgets already, which has forced the layoff of literally thousands of nurses and health care workers across this province. It is going to cut more than a further \$400 million out of hospital budgets next year. Meanwhile, it is closing not five, not 10, but literally dozens of hospitals across this province, but it is not putting in place any community alternatives to the services that used to be obtained in those hospitals.

On the education front, the government is trying to say to people that its education agenda is all about waste and inefficiency, but in fact what we're seeing is that \$1.2 billion has already been taken out of education, which has severely hurt adult education, which has severely hurt early childhood education, which has forced all kinds of cuts in the classroom, and the government has an agenda to take a further \$1.5 billion out of education.

Finally, we're now seeing the downloading, and in Toronto the megacity and downloading, agenda. That agenda is all about forcing down on to municipalities over \$1.5 billion in health care costs and costs for social assistance and costs for things like child care, policing, seniors' housing, homes for the aged, public health and so on.

Where is all this money going? Where is the more than \$2 billion that's going to be taken out of health care going to go? Where is the more than \$2 billion that's being taken out of education going to go? Where is the more than \$1.5 billion that's going to be forced on to municipalities going to go? It's going to go to finance this government's tax scheme, which is overwhelmingly going to benefit the wealthiest people in this province. Any economist worth her or his salt will tell you that if you simply do the numbers on this government's income tax scheme, two thirds of the benefits of their income tax scheme are going to go to the 10% who are at the very top of the income ladder.

So people like Matthew Barrett at the Bank of Montreal, who receives \$3.9 million a year in compensation from the bank, is going to get a huge gift from the Harris government, a huge gift. The Premier's dear friend Mr Stronach at Magna International, whose total compensation is in the neighbourhood of \$48 million a year, is going to get a huge gift from this government.

The reality is this: We're going to see across Ontario holes and cracks cut in our health care system by this Conservative government, our education system turned upside down and inside out by this government and holes and cracks cut in our communities in order that this government can give a large tax benefit to the wealthiest people in this province.

This government is prepared to sacrifice our health care system, prepared to sacrifice our system of education, prepared to sacrifice our communities, which have been the foundation of our economic productivity and our social stability. This government is prepared to sacrifice all those things, cut holes and cracks in all of those

things, in order that they can give the wealthiest people in this province a tax gift.

That is what is really happening here. We wanted this opposition day, on the eve of this government's steam-rolling some of its legislation through the House, to bring focus to what is really happening, to bring focus to the fact that we're undermining our education system so that this government can give its wealthy friends a tax cut.

Who wins and who loses here? Obviously our health care system loses, our education system loses, our communities lose. But what's more, all of Ontario eventually loses in this. All of Ontario loses because the fact of the matter is that the system of education we've built in this province has been the foundation of much of our economic productivity, has been the foundation of much of the social stability that contributes to that economic productivity.

Even the Premier says it when he goes abroad. When he goes to France or Germany or Switzerland he says to them: "Ontario has got an excellent education system, a well-trained workforce. That's why you ought to come to Ontario and invest." Yet here, now in this Legislature we see a government that is prepared to sacrifice the long-term success of our system of education to satisfy their short-term political agenda, which is to give their wealthy friends a tax gift.

What happens when we cut holes and cracks in our communities? What happens is this: Communities that have been very successful, communities that have generated social solidarity, communities that have been productive collectively since the end of the Second World War and which have allowed all of us to be more productive individually start to crack and crumble. When that starts to happen, our capacity to be productive, our capacity to have that social cohesion, that social stability we will especially need as we enter the 21st-century economy, we start to lose.

I would say in a very general sense that to have a productive population, you have to have a healthy population. That is something we can be very proud of, something we have achieved especially in the last 50 years: very good general rates of health and healthful living in this province. A healthy population, a healthy workforce has been a productive workforce. But this government is even prepared to cut holes and cracks in that in order to satisfy their short-term political agenda. Again, that short-term political agenda is to give a large tax gift to people in this province who are already very wealthy.

We are opposed to this. For all kinds of reasons we are opposed to this. For all kinds of reasons we believe this is exactly the wrong way to go, that this is quite counter-productive, that making people who are already very wealthy even wealthier gets us nowhere in the long run, contributes nothing in a positive way to Ontario in the long run. What we're seeing is Robin Hood in reverse: taking from communities, taking from ordinary families, taking from people who are already not well off in order to give to those who are very well off. This is quite counterproductive.

1550

We're quite opposed to this, but what's more, we know this is not going to work. We know, for example,

that the megacity bill, Bill 103, and the attendant downloading, \$531 million within the boundaries of Toronto alone, is not going to work; that it is not going to create a situation which will make Toronto a strong city, which will make Toronto the kind of urban environment where people want to continue to invest, where people want to continue to work, where people want to continue to live. In fact, Bill 103 is going to create quite an unworkable scenario.

I want to say to the government here and now that you will be the government for a very short time. You will not be around for a long time. You will be the government for a short time. With some good fortune and hard work, we will become the government of this province again. When we do that, we will revoke Bill 103, we will do away with Bill 103, and we will sit down and do the work that really needs to be done in terms of the problem of urban governance in the greater Toronto area, in terms of the problems of urban sprawl, in terms of the problems of economic coordination. We will create again urban structures that work for people, local urban government structures that work for people, that allow people to engage in a debate and dialogue with government, urban government structures that provide for responsible government and for responsive government.

What you're doing here, this huge project in social engineering in terms of Bill 103 and the downloading, is not going to work. I say to people in the greater Toronto area and all across this province that we recognize it is not going to work. We recognize there will be a lot of work needed to correct and improve the ugly situation that this Conservative government is going to leave behind, and we are prepared to do that.

But I would say to this government, as we enter into the next three days in this House, that it is still not too late to admit that you have taken a wrong turn; it is still not too late for you to recognize that your unworkable strategy, that your move away from responsible government, your move away from responsive, local government, is not going to work. It is not too late for you to recognize that.

I would say, as this debate unfolds here today, that I hope the government will listen. I hope the government, before it makes further errors, before it makes further mistakes in the furtherance of the mistakes it has already made, will finally listen to people, will finally acknowledge that 76% of the people in Toronto are not wrong when they vote against the megacity; that mayors and reeves and councillors across this province are not wrong when they oppose the downloading; that boards of education and people who care about education across this province are not wrong when they oppose the massive centralization of education that is happening under this government and this government's plans to massively reduce educational finance in this province.

People are not wrong to do that. People are going to continue to do that. People are going to continue to oppose this government's agenda. That opposition is going to build, and we're going to be with all those people who are opposed to this very destructive agenda. I only say to the government that it is not too late to listen, it is not too late to listen to the people of this

province, it is not too late to change. I look forward to the rest of the debate.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham East): It's a pleasure to rise today and be the leadoff speaker for the government side on opposition day number 4, presented by the NDP, the third party.

Bill 104 is clearly one of the key issues of this legislative session, and with good reason. Bill 104 focuses on fewer school boards, fewer trustees, recognizes the four constitutional groups, deals with the division of assets and liabilities, increases the role of parents and deals with the transition process, through the EIC. Bill 104 does not deal with teachers or curriculum issues.

As I am sure members are aware, the provisions of this bill are part of a wider program of education reform aimed at increasing quality and raising standards. People have acknowledged that there must be change, but say perhaps on occasion we are moving too quickly.

I want to bring to your attention a couple of articles written by some respected educators. One is an article by the director of education in the Durham Board of Education, a man whom I have a great deal of respect for, Grant Yeo. In an article entitled "Change Process Must Be Inclusive" in *Education Today*, published December 1996, just a few remarks from this article to lead to the idea, the concept, that change is inevitable really:

"The past few years, which have been characterized by rapid change, have seen the evolution of conflicting views regarding Canadians' expectations of schools. People have expressed dissatisfaction with achievement, learning outcomes and the instructional practices used in today's classrooms. Taxpayers without children in schools have questioned the costs of education. The costs and level of achievement are being linked to 'global competitiveness.' Various groups of parents, taxpayers and the business community have their own views of the problems with the system and have proposed their own solutions. Educators are faced with wide-ranging reforms without a clear consensus or definition of the role of education during a period of downsizing and constraint." He goes on to explain that we must work together for the changes that are inevitable in education.

For the viewer today I'll just read on to rationalize or justify the need for change. It's important that we recognize that this isn't a new phenomenon. I'm going to give a couple of quotes here to the viewer to understand the context of the changes.

"I am concerned about the appearance of a system that is over-bureaucratized and still has not as much accountability as we want it to have. The financing issues must obviously be addressed, but in the context of making the system more efficient as well as fair." This is a letter to the Minister of Education — at the time, Tony Silipo — October 15, 1991, and it was from the Premier of the day, Bob Rae. So there again, he's acknowledging that we must address the financing system and the fairness of the system.

To conclude my reference points today: "In Canada, we spend per capita more than most other places in the world. I think it's a question of focus and a question of how we can get the system to do its job." This again was from Bob Rae, in the *Ottawa Citizen*, February 6, 1992.

So it's clear from those people who are respected by various political views that change was something we were looking for and that is required.

Our education reforms are based on extensive consultations with the people of this province over the past years. It has involved 24 separate reviews of finance and governance in the past six decades. It includes two royal commissions, 10 other commissions and committees, two fact-finding reports, two panels and thousands and thousands of meetings. The problem, I pose to you today, has been not haste but rather a lack of action.

Many of these commissions and task forces have been concerned with the issue of using property tax to pay for education. This issue, I can assure you, is not new. When I was first elected as a school trustee in 1982, that was the issue: the fair funding of equity in education. In fact, it was in that context that the separate school system was funded by the then Premier, Bill Davis, a controversy that still outrages many people today.

Many circumstances have changed over the years, and property tax in education was the focus of a government review as far back as 1935; in 1950, the Royal Commission on Education chaired by Supreme Court Justice John Hope; again in 1985, the Macdonald Commission; as well as the Fair Tax Commission in 1993.

1600

Our government proposes to act through Bill 104 to make the needed improvements to our system of funding education and allocation of responsibilities for education governance. For example, one important issue addressed by Bill 104 concerns the French-language school boards. With passage of this bill, many Ontario francophones would for the first time be able to exercise the right to govern their own school boards. The same recommendation was made back in 1968 by the Committee on French Language Schools in Ontario and again in 1991 by the report of the French Language Education Governance Advisory Group. This government, unlike those of the past, is prepared to take action, to take the bold step to meet the outstanding, long-standing concerns of the Ontario francophone community.

Finally, in the past five years alone, I bring to members' attention, we have had the disentanglement report, the Fair Tax Commission, the Royal Commission on Learning, the Ontario School Board Reduction Task Force — the Sweeney report — and the Crombie Who Does What panel all supporting major change to education finance to create a fair funding model for every student in Ontario. Who could disagree with the findings of those reports from almost every party? The difference is that this government is prepared to act.

Our proposed reforms in Bill 104 address people's concern that the education system is not delivering the quality of education that our students need today. It also responds to their concerns that school board spending is not accountable and that residential property taxpayers, many of whom are seniors on a fixed income, can no longer bear the year-over-year tax increases they have come to expect. Often some school boards act with little, if any, accountability and some disregard for the taxpayer.

The government of Ontario is building a quality education system which has several important principles,

including focusing resources on the individual student and teacher in the classroom. We promised it during the election; we're delivering it now. It's the student in the classroom. By developing a rigorous and relevant province-wide curriculum for testing, Bill 104 sets the framework for improvement to the education system by allowing us to focus on the needs of our Ontario students so that funding is no longer the burden of individual communities and the taxpayer.

Bill 104 is the first step to a broader context of education reform that this government envisions. Bill 104 is a vital component that will support the process of change and help us achieve our goal of higher-quality education, affordable and accountable to all taxpayers, and most importantly the students of Ontario.

This will include, I might add, provisions for the Ontario government to fund the cost of assisting students in special circumstances such as students learning English for the first time in a classroom, new Canadians; students with special needs, special education; and students in remote communities or students in inner-city communities. The process of change would also lead to a system where education is funded fairly so all students in Ontario have equal opportunity and there is full accountability to students, parents and the taxpayers of Ontario.

We see an education framework which focuses resources where they belong: on the individual student, the teacher and the classroom. The Ontario government is taking the first step to ensure that education funding supports a high-quality system meeting all students' needs regardless of where they live. There will be no second-class students in Ontario. We heard our minister repeat that expression today and that's his commitment and pledge.

I want to urge all my colleagues to pass Bill 104 so that we will begin the task of introducing a new funding model which will allow us to focus on students' needs and end any unnecessary spending on administration and ensure that every dollar goes to the students' needs. Funding education fairly will ensure that all students in Ontario will have equal opportunity and at the same time that public money is invested and used wisely.

As a context for the need to reform and to address our students' needs, I would refer members to this week's edition of the Economist, to an article entitled "Education and the Wealth of Nations." This article goes on to explain the class size and funding model and the impact on outcomes. It questions many of the long-held concepts that the more you spend, the better the marks.

We also need to have a framework in place to allow us to focus on building and measuring a quality education system — our students deserve no less — a system that focuses resources on individual student and teacher in the classroom, a commitment made in the Common Sense Revolution and repeated here again today. It develops a rigorous and relevant province-wide testing curriculum, sets standards that will challenge students to excel and ensures accountability to students, parents and taxpayers. Bill 104 is a vital component and will support this process of change and will help us to achieve our goal of high-quality education for all students of Ontario.

I participated in the public meetings on Bill 104. We heard from over 300 parents, teachers, organizations,

boards of education, small business people and, most importantly, students. There were views expressed from all sides of the issue, no doubt, as there always are. But I might add that the Ontario Parent Council and the students of Ontario spoke and repeated in their presentations support for most parts of this bill. I can assure you that the government members listened to all input to the standing committee on social development. We all know that there have been significant amendments brought forward.

It would be important for me to outline a number of the amendments that have been discussed by the committee. Outsourcing, section 335(3)(f), is a very important aspect of the bill. The amendment now has changed the wording from being more active to "consider, where appropriate," the outsourcing concept.

I might add I have a resolution that will be debated this Thursday morning and I'm looking for support from all sides. That also looks at not that outsourcing of non-instructional things shouldn't happen; it should be considered, but it doesn't necessarily have to happen. We should know what it costs us to teach and to clean and maintain our schools.

There are amendments, but I think the most important one from hearing the public input was to the Education Improvement Commission. There was some suspicion that it was beyond the grasp of the courts. In fact, section 344 was rescinded. I just want to assure members that there have been significant amendments to the EIC and other aspects of the bill.

In conclusion, I support Bill 104 as a government member and as a parent of five children. I urge all members of this House today to look ahead to a new future. You have heard and learned from the third party. They're clinging to the ways of the past. Tax and spend, that's their legacy. Our plan offers a vision and hope for the future and our children.

1610

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): The member for Durham East referred to the Economist. I ask him to look at another issue of the Economist earlier this year, when they were doing a profile of the Premier of this province, Mike Harris. In this profile of Premier Harris, examining what the Premier has done to Ontario and Metro Toronto, they referred to the Premier as "Bomber Harris." I think the Economist has a pretty good feel for what this government and this Premier have done to Ontario and to Metro. It's bombing the most productive, most competitive city in Ontario, maybe in Canada.

Bills 104 and 103 are instruments that the Premier is using to destroy and dismantle very successful education systems and municipal governments in Metro. This Premier says, like his minister, they don't give a darn what the people have said or are saying, whether it be at the hearings — on Bill 103 hundreds of people told the Premier to withdraw the bill. What does the Premier do? He still rams it ahead. Cosmetic changes: He withdraws things that the courts told him to withdraw, like the illegal transition team and the illegal trusteeship. That's the change he made. Then what does he do? He sets up these counterfeit councils that have no budgets, no staff. They're nothing. That's what he calls amendments that are listening amendments.

The Premier doesn't fool anybody in Metro Toronto. The 400,000 people who emphatically said no to his megacity madness will not be fooled, as they won't be fooled by Bill 104. The people of Metro know that's a basic, unadulterated tax grab. They're trying to get hundreds of millions of dollars from the property taxpayers of Metro, take it out of Metro and put it into the provincial treasury to pay for that stupid tax cut.

You don't fool anybody. The people know what the Premier is up to. They know what the Minister of Education is up to. They don't quite know what the Minister of Municipal Affairs is up to, but at least they know they're doing damage that will last for decades to a very viable province and a city and a metropolitan region that has been the success story that everybody has certainly applauded over the years.

This is a Premier who ducks debates. Time and time again he was asked to go to debates about the megacity: no show. It's the no-show Premier. Peekaboo Premier we should call him maybe. He shows up when he thinks the handlers are correct and he can make an appearance. He wouldn't show up at the megacity debates. He ducks them. He won't confront people who have raised legitimate questions: How can you call this mega-government with 57 councillors local government? He's created a monster government that's going to be so bureaucratic that it will take weeks and weeks to debate one item. This is not local government. He's destroyed local government in Metro Toronto. He's dismantled it. He thinks he can fool people.

Just like education: The parents and the students of Metropolitan Toronto know you're trying to take money out of classrooms. They know you're trying to destroy public education. Nobody is fooled by it. So all the rhetoric, all the spin-doctoring, all the mega-media that support these crazy initiatives don't fool ordinary people, because at all those public meetings in churches and schools across Metro, time and time again they told you they don't want your megacity. They told you they don't want your big, bureaucratic, expensive government. Yet you say, "We're going to do it anyway."

Four hundred thousand people, almost 80% of the voters in Metropolitan Toronto, on an unprecedented, historic day on March 3, emphatically said, "Mr Premier, take your megacity and shove it." That's what they said. What does the Premier do? He says: "I don't really think you knew what you were voting on. Only I can interpret what you voted on. We're going to give it to you anyway."

Like I said before, no matter how you dress up this megacity pig, it's still a pig, and this pig won't fly. Even though you'll be able to ram this bill through, as you think you will, people will not forget what you've done. These are 400,000 taxpayers, 400,000 citizens who will not forget that despite their legitimate pleas for you to listen, you just laughed and went on and said, "We're going to do it anyway and we're going to get away with it." They still think that people will forget. They still think that people aren't serious about the fact they went to all these meetings. They still think, with the wonderful submissions we had in the hearings on Bill 103, that those people can be fooled.

If you look at the calibre of people who made deputations on Bill 103, there are not too many of them who are fooled by dressing up this megacity pig with your counterfeit councils. They aren't going to buy it, Mr Premier. You should stop ducking, you should stop obfuscating, you should stop window-dressing and do what the people have said. They don't want your big 57-member megacity council that is going to be run by party politics. We know you're going to run a slate of Conservatives to take over the megacity so you can have a partner in megacity with your mega-mayor and your megaschool board.

I know my colleague from Thunder Bay is going to talk about it. Can you imagine in Toronto a 300,000-student school board, centralized control that would even make Joe Stalin turn over in his grave? This is going back to things that failed in Moscow. We're going to have a school board of 300,000, a mega-government with a budget of over \$6 billion here in Metro. It's not going to do it.

Even though, as I said, Bill 104 and Bill 103 may be jammed through, and the snickering on the other side may continue as they try and jam these bills through this week, the people of Metropolitan Toronto will not forget it. Those citizens will fight you. They will oppose you. They will resist it. No matter how much money you spend on television propaganda, no matter how much the mega-media support you, the people of Metropolitan Toronto will not let you forget it, Mr Premier, because the buck stops at your door. This is your harebrained scheme to destroy what has worked well. This is a power grab that destroys things that have worked well for children in the schools and worked well for citizens in our city.

Just remember that, wherever you are, Mr Peekaboo Premier. People will not let you forget this and they will not forget what you've done to their very homes and their communities and their schools and what counts. Just remember that, members opposite. All of you are just as compliant in what the Premier has done. Don't try and say you were just following orders. You are part of the dismantling. You are as guilty as the Premier and his henchmen and his backroom frat boys of destroying our schools, our cities and our communities.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I am glad to have a chance to speak to this opposition day motion, which obviously, among other things, touches on a couple of important bills, Bills 103 and 104, and to say how clearly we are opposed in the New Democratic Party caucus to the agenda of the Mike Harris government. We are opposed because it has as its basis a fundamental shift in the power and in the wealth in this province.

We know that underlying every significant action of this government is that very clear philosophical bent to ensure that those who are already well off in this province will become more well off and those who are already pretty powerful in this province will become even more powerful. The way that is happening is by taking services, powers and rights from the average citizen in this province. We are seeing it in spades in the activities of this government in the last few months. We certainly see it in Bill 103, in the creation of one megacity in

Metropolitan Toronto. We certainly see it in Bill 104, with the creation of enormous school boards not just here in Metropolitan Toronto but across the province, with the reduction of services, with the reduction of control the average citizen will have over those local institutions. We are seeing it in the cuts to our health care system. We are seeing it in spades everywhere we look.

The reason this government is doing this is fundamentally so it can pay for the tax cut, which we know is going to benefit those who are already the richest among our society. I know it irritates the members opposite when we remind them of that. I know it irritates the backbenchers particularly when we remind them that they are being compliant in this scheme that Mike Harris and company have cooked up, but that's what's happening.

We are seeing on the education front people now having to resort to actions like we are seeing today, where a number of support workers are occupying the office of the Minister of Education. Actions like that are indeed all that is left for people to express their outrage at what this government is doing. Those individuals are clearly expressing their sense of frustration and outrage at what is going to happen through Bill 104, particularly with the contracting out of services that now are being provided within the school system.

We know there has been no study done by this government on what the impact of these changes will be. We know there has been no assessment of what is going to happen when you take \$1 billion out of the education system, which is the main reason the Minister of Education and the Premier of this province want to have total control over the education spending and over the way in which the tax assessments are set out across the province. That's why they're shifting the costs of education from the property tax base on to the provincial base. It's not because they believe in a fairer way to fund education. If they wanted to do that, they wouldn't shift back to the property tax base an even greater load through the social service and long-term-care costs and other costs they're pushing back down on to the property tax base. That's what is happening, and I certainly have seen it most closely as I have been following the discussions and the debate on Bill 103.

1620

Let me say that it is not just the downloading, it is not just the individual pieces of that bill that are so offensive. The minister today stood up and said, "We have made a change here, we have made a change there." It shows me they have not listened, have not heard at all what people said in the referendum here in Metropolitan Toronto when they said no to the megacity.

Yes, the people were saying no to the download; absolutely they were. Yes, they were saying no to the draconian powers being given to an unelected trio of trustees over the elected councils of Metropolitan Toronto. Yes, they were saying no to having a transition team that would be charged with the responsibility for governing at the local level for the next year or year and a half. But they were also saying no fundamentally to the process, to the way in which this government wants to continue to ram through this legislation, and they were very clearly saying no to the concept itself of having one megacity,

one large city in Metropolitan Toronto that encompasses 2.3 million people, and it will grow. You can't have a decent level of local accountability and interaction between the elected officials and the citizens when you have a council that is responsible for such a large city.

We have suggested a way in which the government could have dealt with this and still can deal with the important need to restructure the delivery of services and the governance that goes with that as it applies to this large area known as the greater Toronto area; an area, I might remind people, that encompasses about 40% of the province's population, not to mention a great deal of the economic activity of not just the province but indeed the country.

What we have said is that the way out of this morass, the way out of this mess they have caused is to stop and do what should have been done, to do what the two previous major studies on this issue have said, which is first and foremost to restructure the governance at the regional level, to acknowledge in the governance structure what everyone already knows and acknowledges; that is, that the economic entity today is no longer Metropolitan Toronto, is no longer York region, is no longer Peel region or any of the other two regional municipalities but is indeed the whole of the greater Toronto area.

What you need is in effect to move from the present five different regional governments to one regional government that encompasses and has responsibility not only for the coordination of services but indeed for the governance of some of those services, such as public transit, such as economic development.

That's what should be done, not the pitiful attempt being made by this government to layer on top of the two existing layers of government in the GTA, in the 905 area, a third level, the Greater Toronto Services Board, and pretend that somehow they're giving us less government when they're adding a layer of government in the 905 area. They pretend they're doing this because people want it. People in Metropolitan Toronto say to them, "We don't want this," but they persist in making decisions like this.

We have said therefore that what you need to do, just like Crombie and Golden recommended, is to deal first and foremost with the issue of governance at the regional level; then second, within that, to look at what the new cities, the new local municipalities within that greater Toronto area should look like.

We have said time and again that we are not here defending the status quo. We are not suggesting that there should not be changes from the present number of municipalities and indeed the structure of those municipalities. In fact, we believe there should be changes, but that discussion needs to be done in a way that involves the citizens not just within Metropolitan Toronto but indeed in all of the greater Toronto area.

I find it really interesting that we have the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs quoted as he was on Sunday, March 23, in an edition of the *Era* Banner, a newspaper just to the north of us here, in which, in speaking to an audience of people in the 905 area, he assured them the Tories have no intention of imposing megacities outside Metro Toronto. "We want homegrown solutions," he said.

That's good, but we want homegrown solutions everywhere in the GTA, I say to my colleague across. There is no sense in applying one approach to the 905 area and another approach to inside Metropolitan Toronto. There is absolutely no sense in saying that democracy applies in one part of the province but it doesn't apply in another part of the province.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): It does if you're a Tory.

Mr Silipo: I guess it does if you're a Tory. Maybe that's really the only logic there is to all this madness.

One of the amazing things that has happened, and I think we can thank Mike Harris for this, is that people are actually understanding what is going on. People showed that understanding not just through the hearings on Bills 103 and 104 but during the referendum process here in Metropolitan Toronto, and people are not going to go away. Something has started across this province that is not going to go away, because as people understand the agenda of the Mike Harris government, they will be there. Whatever bills you pass, they will be there to ensure that you are no longer here to carry on this insanity come the next election.

We will, as my leader has said, commit to revoking this insanity, particularly in terms of Bill 103, and to doing what needs to be done, which is to ensure that there is real restructuring, that there is real planning that involves the citizens of this province on issues of civic governance, on issues of school governance and, most importantly, in ensuring that the basic services of health care, education and social services go along with a sense of accountability at the local level that takes into account a relationship that makes sense between the electors and their elected councils. That's the approach we will take.

Let me just say in conclusion that we will continue this week, beyond this opposition day motion today, as the government continues to try to ram through Bills 103 and 104, to use every conceivable measure that is available within the rules of this legislative process to stop and stall what the government is doing, because it's fundamentally wrong; we know that. Most importantly, the people of the province of Ontario are understanding more and more that what they're doing is fundamentally wrong.

1630

Mr Dan Newman (Scarborough Centre): It's my pleasure today to rise as the member for Scarborough Centre to take part in the debate on opposition day motion number 4. This motion is nothing more than an acknowledgement on the part of the leader of the third party, the NDP, that they failed to address during their five years in office the very real concerns of tax reform, municipal restructuring, education governance reform, education funding and hospital and health care restructuring. It's an omnibus motion that deals with Bill 103, Bill 104, Who Does What, tax reforms and the public hearing process. Someone told me they saw a draft copy of this motion that had a "whereas" clause that said, "Whereas the sky is falling," but I wouldn't believe that would be in the final copy.

The leader of the third party told us today about his party forming the next government, but before he goes

and selects a cabinet and a new office and a few hundred people for his office, he ought to be reminded about the NDP's legacy of the deficit and the debt.

We look at the years from 1990-91 when the deficit was \$3 billion in this province and they borrowed \$3 billion. In 1991-92 the deficit climbed to \$10.9 billion and they borrowed \$10.8 billion. The next fiscal year, 1992-93, the deficit was \$12.4 billion, a staggering amount of money, and \$15.5 billion needed to be borrowed to finance that deficit. In the fiscal year 1993-94 the deficit was \$9.4 billion and \$11.6 billion had to be borrowed. In 1994-95 the deficit was \$8.3 billion and \$10.1 billion was borrowed.

Before he goes and selects a cabinet, I think he ought to remember those high deficit and debt figures, because quite truthfully, the people of Ontario have not forgotten that.

He also speaks in his motion about education and listening to parents and educators. Quite frankly, I'm shocked, surprised and disappointed that he didn't include students in that, because as legislators in all parties it's our duty to listen to parents, educators and most importantly students, because the students, after all, are the future of our province and of our country. I believe those students must be listened to. I not only support Bill 104 as an MPP, but like the member for Durham East, I support it as a parent.

In terms of health care restructuring, what I'm proud about in our government's health care restructuring is that it puts the patient first. It doesn't put bricks or mortar first, it doesn't put administration or wasted duplication first, it puts the patient first. That's something I'm quite proud of. In the Common Sense Revolution we made a commitment to funding health care in this province at \$17.4 billion, but in the fiscal year that ended just yesterday, the budgeted figure for health care was \$17.7 billion.

That, I might bring to your attention, is \$700 million more than the provincial Liberals would have spent on health care according to their infamous red book. I need to remind everyone once again that the only government that's cutting health care in the province of Ontario is the federal Liberal government of Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin.

The leader of the third party today spoke about nurses and health care workers being displaced. I'd like to read a quote here from someone he may be familiar with, Carolyn Davies, a nurse practitioner from London. I think her name appeared on some NDP signs during an election.

She's quoted in the London Free Press of March 24, 1997, just last week: "Displaced nurses will have opportunities to enter a new kind of community-based health care system that will emerge out of the current restructuring and reform process. I know a lot of people are worried, but this could be the most exciting time ever for nurses, because we have an opportunity to shape that reform." That's quite a startling comment from Carolyn Davies, the former NDP candidate.

The Sudbury Star, March 23, 1997, also last week:

"After all, part of the restructuring plan calls for funding increases for community-based care and many of

these displaced hospital workers will find employment in such operations. As well, many of the job cuts will be as a result of attrition.

"But what is lost in all these events is that the current system is unworkable. There's a sizeable number of beds within the hospital system that lay vacant either because there's no funding or need for them. The amount of duplication in the current system does little to enhance the level of health care enjoyed by Sudburians, but it does limit the funds available to other segments of the health care system."

So it's not only government members who are saying this.

In terms of other health care reinvestments, \$83 million has been spent for hospital services benefiting more than 30,000 patients. That includes \$35 million for cardiac care, benefiting 11,700 patients with heart disease. Some 3,600 more patients will continue to receive mental health services with an additional reinvestment of \$18 million; 250 more patients will receive treatment with \$11 million being reinvested in dialysis services and kidney transplants; 13,700 cancer patients will benefit from a reinvestment of \$8 million; 80 more patients will benefit from a \$5-million reinvestment in transplants; 200 more patients will receive life-saving trauma services through a \$3-million reinvestment; 1,200 more patients will receive hip or knee replacements through a \$3-million reinvestment.

The reinvestments continue: \$25.1 million for community-based, long-term services; home care and services for people with physical disabilities benefiting more than 15,000 patients in Metropolitan Toronto; \$2.9 million to expand community-based mental health services across Toronto and Peel region; \$29.1 million to build new long-term-care facilities and expand community health centres in Metro Toronto and York region; \$1.8 million to expand community-based mental services through Hamilton-Wentworth, Halton and Brant regions; and \$18.9 million for the new and expanded Windsor Regional Cancer Centre, which will treat 2,500 patients.

I'm curious how the member for Windsor-Sandwich feels about that reinvestment. I haven't heard her talking about that today, as she usually speaks about health care.

The motion also talks about the public hearing process and public consultation. Well, the leader of the third party should talk. It's the NDP that brought in changes to the standing orders to bring about the ability for governments to bring in time allocation motions, and the reason they brought that in is that they chose to bring in time allocation 23 times during their five years in office.

In fact, he has no credibility in lecturing us on the public consultation process when on Bill 48 in 1993, better known as the social contract, there were no public hearings and no public consultation; they simply rammed it through the Legislature. The people of Ontario never forgot that.

As I am sure you know, I will not be supporting this motion. Had the motion actually said that the NDP had failed to act on tax reform, municipal restructuring, education governance reform, education funding and hospital and health care restructuring, I could have supported it. They had five years to correct all these

problems. They seem to have all the answers today. I wonder why they didn't have the answers during their five years in office. Perhaps they were too busy taxing and spending the hard-working people of Ontario's tax dollars.

I know the leader of the third party finds it difficult to believe that revenues actually increase when taxes are cut, but it's true, they do. Not only do revenues rise, but so do the number of people working in this province. That's what has happened in Ontario since June 8, 1995, when we formed the government: Taxes have been cut, revenues have increased and jobs have increased in this province, and that's something I am quite proud of.

Just as I know that the leader of the third party has difficulty believing that tax cuts equal jobs and that the sky is not falling, I'd like to take this opportunity to inform the leader of the third party that the Earth is not flat.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I want to speak in support of the motion. In particular, I want to speak to the statement, "Whereas the Harris Conservative government is taking control of schools away from elected...school board members so that it can cut education funding to fund its tax cut scheme," and to the statement that this government is spending millions of dollars on slick advertising campaigns intended to attempt to shore up support for the government rather than seeking real input for its proposals, and I most strongly want to support the call for the government to withdraw both Bill 103 and Bill 104 and to make a new start on reforming municipal and educational governance in Ontario.

I want to first of all ask, though, as presenter after presenter asked when they came before the legislative committee on Bill 104, the bill on school board amalgamations, what's the rush to bring this all about? The changes proposed in Bill 104 are sweeping changes in education governance. They take time to implement properly. Everybody who presented at the committee understood that.

The answer from the government to, "What's the rush?" was that they are in a hurry to get on and save the money they expect to save with amalgamation of school boards. That answer was a little hard to understand, even though it came from the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Education. It was hard to understand because we know that the minister's own study of what they expect to save with this massive amalgamation says it will be about \$150 million, which is less than 1% of the education budget and is barely a tiny contribution to the money the government needs to fund the tax cut.

The fact is that we know that what this government really wants is a lot more than \$150 million. They want at least \$1 billion, and it seems they may want even more than that, that they may feel they can take \$1.5 billion out of education.

This is not going to come from Bill 104. Those kinds of savings cannot be realized through school board amalgamation. In fact, every study in every jurisdiction, including every study that's been done in Ontario on school board amalgamation has said amalgamation will not save money. The government's own consultants have

in fact said that amalgamation may cost more. But the government doesn't want to pay attention to those realities. It wants to get on with its massive amalgamation. It wants to try and claim there will be savings, that the money will go back into the classroom. Not a chance, because even the \$150 million the minister says he may be able to save with amalgamation is going to be achieved by taking money directly out of the classroom, whether it is for school supplies and equipment or education support personnel or even the busing of students.

1640

There is no question that what this bill is all about is taking control by government: first taking control of education governance, making school boards totally ineffective, and then taking over education funding. When the government has total control it will be easier for this government to make the cuts and find the \$1 billion-plus they need for their tax cut.

The problem, of course, is that the whole scheme is wrong. It's wrong-headed and it wasn't thought through from the very beginning. I wonder if this government really thought the municipalities wouldn't figure out that they were getting a lot more dumped on them than the government was picking up in education. I suppose no one cared to think about the human and the social consequences of offloading welfare and long-term care and public health and ambulances and social housing and child care on to the municipal tax base. Clearly the Harris government didn't care and didn't hesitate to abandon any responsibility for maintaining some kind of equity in any of these social areas.

But the government does, strangely enough, want to talk about equity in education. The government wants to claim that is why it is instituting these massive changes, why it's taking over education funding. But the real agenda of this government is not about equitable funding. The real agenda of this government is about cost-cutting. It is about finding the \$1 billion that John Snobelen, the Minister of Education, boasted he could find and that the Premier said last November he needed for his tax cut.

I suggest there are two reasons at least some portion of the cost of education should be left on the property tax base. One is to allow some local flexibility, some local accountability, and to preserve local governance and local decision-making in education. I strongly argue that keeping some portion of education costs on the property tax base does not stop any government from ensuring that there is equitable funding provided through its grant system if that is really the government's concern. The second reason for keeping education on the property tax base is quite simply that removing it entirely is unaffordable, and we have seen the price in offloading to be paid for that.

I strongly argue as well that the idea of having municipalities pick up the cost of school construction, maintenance of our schools, secretarial services and busing is not the solution to the mess the Conservatives have already created. This so-called solution would be disastrous for students in our schools and disastrous for the school communities. We heard this repeatedly in our hearings. We heard it most particularly from parents who spoke to

our committee, who write to us, who say that every member of the school staff is an integral part of the school community and the essential support their children need.

The solution, incidentally, would also leave the municipalities with huge financial pressures, particularly with some \$2 billion in unmet maintenance needs in public schools alone, not to mention the need for new schools in those growing suburban areas, the very 905 belt this government is so anxious to keep happy.

The government would like people to believe that everything will be fine and the changes that are coming will be positive ones. They are indeed, as the resolution says, spending millions of dollars on television ads to spin that kind of message. I don't think people are any more easily fooled than the municipalities were. The vast majority of the people who raised their concerns at the committee hearings on Bill 104, and that included representations from literally hundreds of parent organizations, said they were worried about what this government is planning to do. They see only one piece of a puzzle and they don't know what else the government is hiding.

It may be that the government doesn't know what it's going to do next either, but that doesn't stop it from ramming its legislation through just as it did a little better than a year ago with its bully Bill 26. Then they will turn the whole thing over to a non-elected, non-accountable commission to figure out what to do next now that they've got their bill passed, and that's just exactly what they did a year ago in turning hospital closures over to the Health Services Restructuring Commission. We've seen the damage that is being done to health care as that arm's-length, non-accountable, non-elected commission rampages across Ontario.

I want to take a moment to tell you what feelings parents have been expressing about Bill 104. These are phrases, words, concerns that have come from particular parent councils: "fear"; "anxiety"; "worry"; "anger"; "demeaned"; "overwhelmed"; "betrayed"; "frustrated"; "concerned"; "horrificed"; "rushed"; "left in the dark while major decisions are made"; "money being spent with no input"; "lack of direction"; "Boards don't seem to know any more than parents"; "What have we done electing this government?"; "We don't know where we live any more"; "Government handling of the megacity scares me"; "It feels like no one is listening"; "We are not against change"; "Do it in an orderly manner"; "We are the consumers of this service. We need to be consulted, advised, educated, informed, shown the plans, know the rules and the strategies, see the big picture."

Those are the kinds of concerns that parents across this province have expressed as they look at this government's proposed changes to education, and those are exactly the concerns that this government is simply going to ignore.

There are a great many specific problems with Bill 104, and those I know will be debated when we have third reading on that bill. The proposals for the boards themselves are wrong because the boards are simply too huge, whether in terms of numbers of students — the new Toronto mega-board will have twice as many

students as the entire province of New Brunswick — or too large geographically, as they certainly are in northern Ontario.

It's being done too fast. You can't implement these kinds of changes unless you take the time to do it properly. There are literally hundreds of contracts which have to be harmonized. Nobody has any idea how that is going to take place.

Parent councils are saying: "We don't want the strengthened role that this legislation talks about. We want to work with the involvement we have in our own schools."

The whole issue of outsourcing, we heard over and over again, is misdirected and disastrous for schools and for students; and of course the incredible powers being given to yet another non-elected, non-accountable commission to implement, to put some flesh on the bare bones of Bill 104 with no direct electoral accountability.

The government itself has no plan for implementing Bill 104. Since they're not going to take the time to get the changes right, without any question this bill will bring chaos into education just as Bill 26 brought chaos into health care.

I'm concerned that much else is being destroyed in this province along with our social programs. Our whole sense of democracy is being eroded by this cynical, bullying government that is ready to ride roughshod over democratic processes, over the views of the majority of citizens and ultimately over people themselves.

1650

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): I'm pleased to have an opportunity today to stand in favour of the motion brought forward by our leader, Howard Hampton, from Rainy River.

We've never, in the province of Ontario, and I believe not in the country of Canada, had any government prior to this government that came into office vowing to reverse everything that was done by the governments that were in power between the last time Progressive Conservatives ran this province and when this government was elected. Frankly, the problem we have with the current government is that this ideological position that everything that has been done in this Legislature by any government other than a government under the label of Progressive Conservatives is wrong is the *raison d'être* of all the policies this government brings forward.

It's quite shocking that not only are they saying they want to undo everything that was done by the previous Liberal government or the previous NDP government, but they're going further and they are undoing many of the programs, many of the policies the Progressive Conservatives themselves brought forward in the past. They are flouting in a very real way the democratic processes that have been developed in this province on which we as citizens have depended in terms of our democratic rights to be sure that our government is guided by the wishes of the electorate.

This government says, time after time, "We consulted for two years before we were elected and that gives us a mandate to do whatever we want while we're in government," and it's quite clear that that's what this government is doing. In Bill 103 they are not listening to the

people of Metropolitan Toronto who overwhelmingly rejected the so-called solution brought forward by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. They are not listening to the people of Ontario, whether they be parents or students or trustees or citizens at large, around Bill 104, around restructuring education. They have not listened.

They are not listening to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario when they protest very clearly the effect of a download on to the backs of property taxpayers, a tax that takes no account of the person's ability to pay. They are not paying any attention to the citizens of Ontario or to those professional experts who deliver health care in the province around the drastic effect that their way of restructuring hospitals and restructuring health care has. Oh, no. They know it all; they know everything.

They stand here day after day telling us and telling the people of Ontario that the effects of their policies are different than the people of Ontario are telling them they are. Day after day, minister after minister stands up and gives us some kind of doubletalk about how black is really white and white is really black, when the people of Ontario know very well that is not the case as it affects them in their own communities.

As we have gone around the province with committees over the last while, we have heard in community after community the real effect of cuts to education, the real effect on students in the classroom, the real effect on the community at large, the real effect on the hope of our communities of training and educating people of all ages so that they may be productive and taxpaying citizens.

In Metropolitan Toronto, subjected to unprecedented attack by a government, a people within an area are attacked again and again by this government that knows that somehow the polls in their very fertile 905 belt give them some hope that by attacking Metropolitan Toronto they will maintain some support in those outlying areas. All we can say to the people in the 905 belt and elsewhere in Ontario is that what they do to Metropolitan Toronto they will do to you. This is the thin edge of the wedge.

This is a government that in its policies said it supported local government. The Premier is on record again and again as saying, "The best decisions are made at the local level." He talked a very fine line about how important the community is, but if we look at Bill 103, we see a blatant attack on communities, we see a blatant attack on democratic processes, we see a blatant attack on the chosen local governments of the electorate.

Similarly, in Bill 104 what do we see? This government knows better than anybody else. It knows better than all the elected trustees in this province. It knows better than all those who elected those trustees. It has an ideological position around "Less is better" that it is trying to foist upon communities, regardless of whether those communities have a community of interest.

This government tries to blame Bill 104 on the fact that our government commissioned a report around the size and the nature of school boards. They neglect at every step of the way to say that the recommendations of the Sweeney report are not the recommendations this

government is putting forward, not at all. This government is putting forward school board boundaries which are very clearly geared to destroy communities of interest, very clearly geared to try and combine areas that have developed in very different ways in terms of their education system, in an effort to create so much confusion, in an effort to create so much chaos in the system, as was recommended by the Minister of Education in his famous speech to his bureaucrats, and that is what this bill does.

It creates a crisis so that this government can, through the Education Improvement Commission, pull some of those much-needed billions of dollars that it needs to finance its tax cut, simple as that, and this government has the nerve to say they were elected on a platform that included this when in fact the opposite is true. In both these instances this government was elected by an electorate that expected them to support local government, whether that's school governance or municipal governance, and the people of Ontario are indeed, as my friend the member for Fort William said, feeling betrayed and feeling as though this government did the opposite of what it was supposed to do.

We talk about hospital restructuring and the health care system in this motion as well, and if the people of Ontario have been betrayed by this government in terms of school governance and in terms of municipal governance, they certainly know they've been betrayed in the area of health care. This is a government that pledged not one cent would come out of health care, and we will see when this government tables the actual expenditures for this year, because we know in the last weeks — and some of the members on the opposite side have even had the nerve to repeat the propaganda campaign of the Minister of Health — the Minister of Health has been running around this province reannouncing money that was already in the budget, that wasn't allocated until the last week or the last two weeks of the fiscal year, in an effort to try and convince people that this government is reinvesting in health care and that it is not taking money out of health care.

We have letters and examples and news stories from all over the province that should tell this government they can only fool some of the people so long, because people who need to act as health care professionals, who need to act as the health care system, are telling us that there are indeed cuts and that the quality of care is being undermined by the cuts that hospitals are sustaining and being undermined by the fact that the services to replace the services that have to be cut in hospitals have not even been announced.

The Minister of Health has not got huge pieces in place in terms of his health restructuring plan. The long-term-care plan is not in place; palliative care is not in place; chronic care is not in place; rehabilitative medicine is not in place. All of these pieces are missing, and yet this Minister of Health is proceeding to cut the funding to see services reduced to agree with formulae that are very suspect in the health restructuring committee, and he is indeed putting the health care of this province at risk.

I certainly support this motion. We all will be supporting this motion, because we believe this government has

overstepped its bounds. It has not taken the care to move carefully and judiciously. It has flouted the democratic processes and it continues to bull its way through this process this week in an unprecedented display of arrogance.

1700

Mr Bill Grimmer (Muskoka-Georgian Bay): I'm pleased today to speak in opposition to the opposition day motion of Mr Hampton. While the motion seems to have trouble focusing on any specific issue, having participated in the recent hearings on Bill 104, I would like to focus on the issues around Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act.

This is the first legislative step towards long overdue reforms that will focus education dollars on the classroom. I think it's important to discuss Bill 104 within the context of our government's overall strategy of reform for Ontario's education system. Bill 104 is one part of a larger plan to restore a higher degree of accountability to our education system. In the past the lack of standards and testing for students in Ontario has made it nearly impossible to measure either the progress of our students or the instruction they receive. International test results suggest that student achievement levels in our system are below other Canadian provinces and below many systems in other countries.

Our government has made Ontario the first province in the country to introduce comprehensive testing through an independent body. Students are being tested at regular intervals in the critical areas of reading, writing and mathematics. The results will give parents and schools a clear picture of what students are being taught and how well they're learning according to an international universal standard. Other initiatives we're taking, including a new standardized curriculum and a standardized report card, will also enable parents and educators to better understand how their children and students are progressing.

Bill 104 is an important part of reform to increase the accountability in the education system. It will open the books of the school board so parents can see where the money is going. In past years, too much time and effort and too many resources have been diverted to items that are not directly related to our children's classroom education. We believe it's time to concentrate our resources and expertise in the classroom. I've had the privilege to participate in both 104 hearings across the province and also at public meetings in my own riding of Muskoka-Georgian Bay, but most recently at Monck Public School in Bracebridge. I've had a chance to hear a wide variety of viewpoints.

I think it's important to comment, as a recently elected member, on the whole hearings process because it has been an eye-opener for me. Having been a trustee on a school board, I've had the opportunity to be present when members of the public come forward at school boards to make their views felt on education matters. But in the committee process I find there are many groups, both pro-government and anti-government, that come prepared with a script. They come to the committee meetings knowing exactly what they're going to say. They often have a position that is hardened, that they're not likely to

sway on, and quite often there seems to be an ulterior motive behind their presentations.

So it is quite healthy and quite surprising when, sitting on the committee, you actually have people who come before you who are objective. While many of the presenters on Bill 104 were not objective and had positions either pro-government or anti-government, there were some people who came before the committee — I think it's important for the public to be aware of this — who were objective and who stated their views and did not apparently have a script from which they were reading.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): Those who were objective, what did they say?

Mr Grimmer: The objective people had views on both sides. Some of them had views generally favourable to the bill, some of them seemed opposed to everything the bill was about, but one of the remarkable things I found with these people was a willingness to listen to the government's rationale and the general provisions in the bill, which are to reduce the administrative spending in public education and try to focus tax dollars best on the classroom, on the students, on the people who really should be the focus of public education in Ontario.

We heard from several trustees on public boards and we also heard from several teachers and ex-teachers who felt there was currently far too much focus on administration, far too much money in public education being spent on administration and that there were opportunities for savings.

I believe it myself and I have served as a trustee on a public board. I was elected for two terms and I certainly felt in my terms on the Muskoka Board of Education that there were areas where savings could be found in administration and there could be more focus on the classroom. What we're trying to do in Bill 104 is reduce the number of school boards, trying to reduce the amount of public resources going into the administration of school boards, and also to reduce not only the number of trustees but also the remuneration trustees receive. I feel there is strong public support in my riding for the notion of reducing administrative expenditures and focusing public education on getting better results in the classroom.

When we were on the hearings we heard from a number of interested parties who had suggestions on how we might amend the legislation, and I think it's important for the public to understand that we were listening to those suggestions and that we have brought in a number of amendments which were brought to our attention and which we felt merited some attention, particularly on the issue of outsourcing. We heard from numerous groups that they felt the paragraphs relating to outsourcing, the powers that the Education Improvement Commission had, were simply too predetermined, and they wanted the commission to be more objective in reviewing whether or not outsourcing was a good idea or not, and we changed the wording.

Reporting the 1997 board spending requirements: There were numerous boards that came before us and said they felt that the monthly reporting requirement set out in the legislation was too onerous for boards to comply with, that they would be sidetracked in their efforts and they would be spending all their time doing

nothing but reporting to the commission. We changed the legislation. We brought in an amendment that said it would be up to the commission to set the time lines on reporting for boards.

We introduced legislation that clarified how disputes in the merger of boards would be dealt with. We removed the general provision against court review of the Education Improvement Commission and we added specifics on dispute resolution to clarify many of the issues that have been raised by people who spoke to our committee. We removed the retroactivity of financial control provisions from the Education Improvement Commission. We removed the retroactive approval of prohibited transactions.

We listened. We listened to people who were concerned about the need for native trustees on school authorities and we added a provision to the existing duties of the Education Improvement Commission to advise on native representation on boards and school authorities. We also listened when presenters from parent groups, from boards and from other interested parties indicated that they felt student representation on school boards was a good idea. We in fact supported an opposition amendment to allow the Education Improvement Commission to make regulation about student representation on district boards.

We are listening to the public. We're interested in the public's comments on Bill 104, and I think you're going to see, when Bill 104 comes before the House, that there will be significant amendments which will receive public approval.

In regard to the motion brought by the opposition, the government is committed to reforming the system to achieve the highest quality possible and restore its accountability to both students and parents, and for these reasons, I will not be supporting the resolution.

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I'm pleased to speak on the motion brought by the leader of the third party. I think it addresses very succinctly the main points in Bill 103 and Bill 104.

As late as today the minister himself has been saying that, yes, he has been listening to the people and because he has been listening to the people they were able to make the suggested changes and amendments, because he has been listening very carefully. Let me say that if the minister indeed was listening very attentively for the four or five weeks of public hearings we had on both Bill 103 and Bill 104, he surely wouldn't have come up with those amendments.

If he had been honest with himself, with his own views on Bills 103 and 104, he would have said, "I can't support, not only the bill, but the amendments I'm being forced to present to the House." Evidently those amendments were not his amendments. He did say that he cannot support any changes to the bill, but he has to go along with it. He has to go along because those changes are being imposed on him, they are being imposed on this House and they are being imposed on the people of Ontario.

What did the people say really? They said two main things, and they said them with such clarity, with such a voice throughout Metro, not only in one particular area of

Metropolitan Toronto but throughout Metro. Number one, they said no to the megacity as it is being proposed by the government. They said no. Number two, they said: "We want to be part of this process. We want to have a say in how you are going to change our governance here within Metro." They didn't say to bring in the changes that the minister has brought into the House today and the other day. Absolutely not.

1710

If the minister was even listening for one day, let alone four or five weeks, or to the comments which would have been brought back by the members of the committee to the minister himself, the people had a real concern, because they said: "We want to be part of the system and not spectators. We just don't want to pay the bills; we want to be part of the exercise." They spoke about taxes. Let me tell you that every one of them spoke with passion and every one of them said, "Surely if we have to make some changes, we'd like to have some input and we'd like to have some time."

Do you think it's fair that today we are being allowed one hour of debate and the bill is about to be introduced by the government side to be approved on a bunch of amendments that absolutely make the bill even that much worse than when it was first introduced? I think if the minister wants to really do something good, really be truthful to his own feeling as he sees this bill, he should make the effort to say, "You know what? I can't support this. I'm not going to vote for it," and most of the backbenchers — because I think the minister wants to get rid of this bill so bad that he can't stand it any more. He is so anxious to get it approved at any cost not because he likes it, not because he wants to, just because he's fed up with it, the pushing that he gets from the Premier and perhaps the other members of the cabinet, not because of his own will.

Throughout the hearings, the people have shown severe concern with the contents and with the process, and they have been saying through the hearings, through the committee, to the Premier and the minister, "Take your time and let's do it right, because what you're doing is not the right way and it's not what we want."

Of course, what do we have now? We have totally nothing new that was not being presented before, but there is a reason for it, and the reason is that the government needs so much money and they need it so quickly and so badly that they are willing to ram it through at any cost. They didn't listen to the mayors of the six municipalities. They didn't listen to the 80% throughout Metro who said, "We don't want it, not this way." We are saying to the government, give us some time so we can have some input and we can make those changes where they are needed, changes that we can accept, changes that can be acceptable to both the people and the government.

It's very unfortunate, because I can see my colleagues saying I have maybe another minute to go, that we have to rush on such an important thing, but I want to say this to the government members: The passage of Bill 104 and Bill 103 will make such fundamental changes both to the way we are governed here in Metro and in Ontario and to the education system that we are going to feel the consequences for many, many years to come.

Why is the government so bent to do this on the backs of the most needy, on the backs of our kids? One third — I have to rush — of the kids living in Metro live in poverty, some 89,000. Why are we putting this oppression on the seniors, on the most needy, on the sick?

I am pleased to have had the few minutes today. I'm pleased to support the motion by the leader of the third party and I hope the government seriously thinks about it before it votes on this particular bill.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): In our quest to be as accommodating as possible, we've once again allowed the NDP the opportunity to be in a position to address our final comments instead of following the normal rotation.

Let me just start off by saying that here we are, 20 months into our term, and I really must despair at the tone and tenor embodied in this motion. Once again we have one of the parties opposite taking another day, at the cost of \$1,000 a minute to operate this chamber, and rather than dealing with the substantive issues, rather than doing the clause-by-clause, rather than doing the consideration of specific bills, rather than doing all the things they tar us for and suggest we're not doing, they're not paying enough attention to the issues. They would rather have the theatrics, they would rather have the less-than-substantive rhetoric that comes out in the course of an opposition day motion.

I think they take it quite literally, the word "opposition." Just like we have archaic terms such as the party "whip," who does not use an instrument by the same name to get us to do good things, the fact they're called the opposition does not necessarily mean all they should ever do is oppose. Surely to goodness they see the same issues before us out there in society. Surely they recognize that while Ontario is the greatest place in the world to live, there are challenges, issues that need to be addressed, that governments should act. But maybe we see in motions such as this the rationale, the insight into how our province fell \$100 billion into debt by governments that chose not to act, that chose not to follow the right course but instead the politically expedient course, the course of not challenging the status quo, of not taking on issues head on.

I'm proud of the fact that we may be accused of a lot of things but we'll never be accused of inactivity. We were elected with a very solid platform, a solid series of commitments. We had consulted across this province for over four years before we prepared the Common Sense Revolution. We had met in town halls, we had formed our policy advisory councils, unpaid volunteers who came forward and, issue by issue, told us what the concerns were across this province.

We distilled all that down into the most comprehensive and specific series of campaign commitments in the history of this province, perhaps in the history of politics in Canada. Now we're acting on those commitments and the members opposite would want to vilify us for actually keeping promises, a radical concept perhaps in the context of the last 10 years, but something I and my colleagues feel very strongly should be a hallmark of all politics and all politicians. Integrity should be the cornerstone of this building.

In terms of the content of this motion, I think it's really quite unfortunate that they have chosen to quite deliberately exaggerate and misspeak certain issues surrounding some of the important legislative initiatives we've undertaken. For example, they're fully aware and were aware on the day this motion was tabled that many of the things they're vilifying us for in Bill 103 had already been addressed in the amendments we brought forward.

The suggestion is that we're not listening. The suggestion is that somehow we have not heard the mood of the people in this city when it comes to Bill 103, and across the province when it comes to bills like 104 and the need to realign health care spending. We have heard. In fact, we have built a very comprehensive checklist of what the 607 people said who took the time to make oral and written submissions to the legislative committee that was hearing Bill 103.

Their concerns basically fell into three categories. They felt there were certain clauses in the original bill, in the draft legislation after second reading, that in some way undermined democracy. We are seen to be intrusive in the affairs of municipal politicians. While we disagreed with that interpretation, none the less we acted and we have taken all of those clauses out.

1720

They suggested that because the time frames weren't specific in there about the end of the mandate for the trustees and the transition that somehow there was the spectre that there was no need to even have municipal elections. Believe it or not, we had people who sat there and suggested that somehow the transition team would sit in perpetuity making appointed decisions for the 2.3 million people in Toronto. Obviously, that was never the intent of the bill, but that has been clarified as well.

There were a number of other concerns expressed about issues such as the fact that the decisions of the trustees and the transition team should be above frivolous court challenges. Well, we've even taken that out and we've taken out the issue's retroactivity. In short, we addressed every single specific suggestion that had been brought forward in the committee hearings and that I had heard and my colleagues had heard at the town hall meetings and face-to-face meetings with constituents across this great city.

They said they were concerned about the taxation impact. Well, we couldn't be more clear. First off, the speculation — quite frankly, fed by opposition members — that somehow this was a grab of the reserves that are sitting there in some of the municipalities is patently untrue. But we've clarified it to the point that now it is very specific that for those two cities currently in Metro Toronto that have a net surplus, those reserves will be kept in those areas for the benefit of the people who live in those former cities. The fact remains that the funds won't flow anywhere else and they certainly were never intended to flow to the provincial government. That was totally uncalled for in terms of the speculation from certain of the members opposite.

We heard one other concern, that somehow there would be an impact on the ability of elected municipal politicians to represent the concerns of their constituents.

Once again, rhetoric got in the way of facts. They ignore the reality that in Mississauga right next door to us each of the 10 councillors not only represents 64,000 people but also serves on the regional government council. So they, in effect, wear their city and Metro hats.

Here the concern was that one politician couldn't represent 50,000. Personally, I think it was quite insulting to the calibre of people who run for office here in Metro Toronto to suggest that they couldn't do a job as well as people in Mississauga, as well as people in Calgary, as well as people in Vancouver, as well as people in many cities across this country who have to represent more than 50,000. But we even made accommodation there. As the members opposite knew full well, we have added another 20% — over 20% in fact — and have gone from 44 municipal politicians up to 56.

We did something else. We had a great number of people who expressed concerns about the future of their community. Many of those people quite correctly observed that the community really is not that artificial political administrative area that we had created at some point in the last 100 years. Communities were shaped by geography, they were shaped by common interests, they were far smaller subsets of the cities than anything we've ever respected with the kind of artificial boundaries that are in place today. I look at ridings such as mine where there are six very distinct communities. Obviously, those communities would continue to exist as is for decades to come. It had no relevance to the artificial political entity, whether it was sitting at Scarborough city hall or at a building somewhere else within Metro.

But having said that, there were some people who said that the community from their perspective was that artificial city, whether it was East York or Etobicoke or Scarborough, and we've even taken that into consideration and have suggested that at the outset the community councils will follow exactly the shape of the existing cities.

Even more to the point, again while they will disparage and malign the people who will stand for office this fall and suggest they don't have the skills and they don't have the capability to do the right thing after January 1, 1998, we believe that the new councillors will be able to make the distinction between those things where we expect common service delivery all across Metro, such as police and fire and ambulance, and those other things that are purely local, such as traffic issues and local planning issues. They will make the appropriate choice and they will assign to the community councils all those functions that should be deemed as being local, not for us to micromanage, not for us to intrude in the day-to-day affairs of the city after January 1, 1998. That is something that the newly elected municipal councillors should be doing.

I'm very proud of the fact that the amendments have addressed all of the substantive and constructive criticisms that were brought forward during the hearings. No, we haven't dealt with that other issue that, quite frankly, Mr Sewell and others would have you believe is really out there as the top-of-mind issue across Metro Toronto. The polling has shown consistently since the election that a core 30% of this city and the province don't agree with

anything our government does. But 30% is smaller than 70%. I would submit that when 81.2% of the people in Scarborough don't even think it's important enough to mail a ballot in, to suggest that they don't have rights, to suggest that they are not making a statement is the height of condescension. It is the height of arrogance to suggest that somehow the 25% who voted no should overwhelm what we're hearing from the 75% who voted yes or who said: "It's not of any concern. I trust the government. I agree with the goal."

Bottom line, when you had the mayors themselves publish a report last November that said, "We believe by consolidating services you will save \$240 million a year" — and they went further; they said the time to do that is right now, without further delay. We sit here four months later and they haven't taken one step to save one cent of that \$240 million.

The opposition would have us believe that somehow if these same mayors and councillors are entrusted to follow their conscience, magically, by dropping this bill, they would find religion and save that \$240 million. Their inactivity two and a half years into their three-year mandate is exactly why we have to do something to change the status quo here in Toronto. The people said the status quo is not an option. The people deserve that \$240 million for better services or lower taxes. We don't need bureaucracy, we don't need duplicate administration; we need a more efficient Toronto that will continue to be the greatest place to live in all the world.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): Absolutely breathtaking.

Just to proceed with the debate, the first thing I think the public should recognize is that before Al Leach was elected, Mike Harris said, "I want a task force on Metro Toronto." They got Al Leach, Derwyn Shea and Morley Kells to look at Metro. What did they decide? They decided this: Keep the cities of Scarborough, Toronto, Etobicoke, North York, East York and York and get rid of Metro. That's what they decided after they'd looked at it. So Mike Harris went around Metro Toronto saying: "Elect me and I'll do the right thing. I'm going to get rid of Metro and keep Scarborough and keep the city of Toronto and keep Etobicoke."

You might wonder why people are so angry now. They say: "Well, wait a minute, Mike. I elected you because you promised you would get rid of Metro and keep Etobicoke, and now you're getting rid of Etobicoke. Why is that?"

The second thing I would say is that we now are getting almost the worst of all possible worlds. To my friends in the business community who are shaking their heads and asking, "How did this legislation get developed?" I say: "It's like eating in a fine restaurant. You don't want to go in the kitchen and see how this stuff is made."

This stuff is made on the back of an envelope. Can any of you, particularly my Conservative colleagues who were in municipal politics, imagine a 57-member council? Can you imagine it? This is the government of: "Smaller is better. We've got to get things down to manageable sizes." Fifty-seven people on the Metro council. It is breathtaking. Where did that come from? It came because

I guess you ran out of time and Mr Gilchrist was at a meeting and Mr Leach was away on the yacht, and they said: "How are we going to solve this thing? Let's double the size of Metro council. There are 28 councillors now. Let's make 56 councillors and then we'll have a chair."

1730

Do any of the backbench members think you can run a municipal council with 57 members? Mr Stewart, you're from Peterborough. You people understand municipal politics. But Mr Gilchrist got his hands on this thing and now we've got 57 people. My gosh, where was your brain when you got this thing together? So that's my second problem.

The people of Metropolitan Toronto voted overwhelmingly against this. I must say I found it breathtaking that Mr Gilchrist said: "Yes, but only 25% voted against it. Imagine the group that didn't vote at all. They would have all voted for it." We would have won the 1990 election with that kind of logic as well, but it doesn't work that way. The way it all works is, those who mark the ballots get the ballots counted. Those who don't show up don't get the ballots counted. It's democracy. So we find — what? — 75% of the people voted against the megacity, but, "Oh, we're going to disregard that because if only those people who didn't vote had voted, they would certainly have approved the megacity."

What we've got is legislation that goes 100% against an overwhelming majority of the public. You can disregard them. You can say: "The public don't know. They simply made a mistake. They don't understand this stuff." I think they understood it completely. They don't want a megacity. They agree with Mike Harris when he was in opposition: A megacity is bad. That's what Mike Harris said when he was in opposition. That's what he said and that's what Al Leach said and that's what Morley Kells said and that's what Derwyn Shea said: Don't have a megacity. The public know that. But for whatever reason — I guess the coin was thrown up in the air and it landed heads, and that was the megacity — that was the decision. Well, it's the wrong decision.

The sad part is that in the rush to, for whatever reasons — I can't imagine the back bench being happy with this bill: 57 people on council. Can any of you imagine it?

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton North): You want 20?

Mr Phillips: The member said, "You want 20?" I want something workable. Mr Hardeman knows his stuff. He's a former councillor in Oxford. He knows that 57 people meeting to deal with municipal matters — what people want on municipal matters is a council that can reflect the local concerns.

You're going to ram this thing through. We are heading to a completely unworkable municipal structure with 57 people sitting, each trying to decide on municipal issues. So it's the worst of all worlds.

Mike Harris has changed his mind and said we're now going to have a megacity. All the people in Metro Toronto who tried to express their view said no, and the bill now, rather than being improved, is made worse. This is a nightmare, and we have to approve it this week? It doesn't make any sense.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Further debate? The Chair recognizes the member for Fort York.

Mr Marchese: Mr Speaker, it is a good time for you to listen to the member for Fort York because I know you're always very attentive to the things I have to say. I'm very pleased to stand up to support the resolution of our leader because in it he raises many of the concerns that are reflected in society as a whole. It's not something that he as a leader of our party is inventing. People are very worried about all of the matters that he has raised, and all of you know that. You know that because as you attempted to respond to the concerns of Bill 103, you attempted in your way to reflect it.

What I have to do before I go on with my remarks is to thank the member for Scarborough East for attending those public flagellations, because that's what they were. He came faithfully, bearing it very well, and fought the good fight for Mike Harris, who told him to go out and do the dirty deed for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. You did well, and I admire that because you were one of the few who went around to defend that particular bad bill, Bill 103.

You've listened a lot, you say, but one of the most important things you didn't listen to was the referendum that told you no to Bill 103. Interestingly enough you say, "We listened to this, we listened to that." You invented a few other things to make it pleasing in a political sense to some of your unfriendly folk out there, but the most important thing that came out of the referendum was: "We want you to revoke the bill. Take it away." That's what they said.

Mr Gilchrist: And do what? What was your alternative?

Mr Marchese: That's something that the people wanted to discuss in fact. That's what the people wanted to talk about. When you say you've listened, you didn't listen to the most important part of that referendum. That referendum told you unequivocally no to Bill 103; not to parts of the bill that they found more particularly offensive, but to the entire bill. That's what people spoke to in Metro. I don't know where you were, but I was in Metro as part of the campaign with everybody else and they said no to the bill. For me it was unequivocal; it was very clear. But I know that for you, you need to mess it up a little bit. You need to pretend that you're listening.

On Bill 103, some of you folks, you and other members who have spoken, talk about reform. You never really explain to the public that's listening what you mean. If you mean by reform that you're very closely associated to the Reform Party, people understand that, but what else you might mean by the word "reform" is totally unclear. None of you has the clarity or — I don't want to say intelligence — to explain what you mean by reform. All of you simply use the word "reform" as if somehow people out there understand what you're talking about.

You then throw these other Reform-minded words that people like out there in the 905 area and some of the other areas beyond the 905, words like "accountability." What does it mean? When you look at the education bill, Bill 104, there is nothing in there that talks about accountability in any way. What you have is a bureaucracy from Toronto, by and large, a centralized bureaucracy to oversee the whole thing in Ontario. Is that

accountability? I didn't think so. I'm not quite sure how, if you move away from the locality, from the local government, you get accountability. In fact most people understand that the farther away you get from those who govern the less accountable it is. We know that.

Mrs Boyd: Mike used to understand that.

Mr Marchese: Mike used to understand that in 1994 when in Fergus, Ontario, he talked about, "Bigger is not necessarily better." He said that.

Mr Gilchrist: In the context of Fergus, that's right.

Mr Marchese: "In the context of Fergus," he now says, trying to take that out of context as well. No, it was quite clear what he was saying then.

There are no savings in Bill 103. There is no evidence of any savings. People talk about "our need to act, our need to take control, our need to deal with the deficit." Well, we were saying, "Prove it," because there is no evidence that you've presented, Mr Gilchrist, you or any other member, that somehow there would be any savings as a result of what you're doing. So it seems to me —

Mr Gilchrist: The mayors themselves.

Mr Marchese: Not the mayors; no evidence whatsoever. We've had professors look at this and study this, not just in North America but in the US, and they clearly stated that bigger is more costly. There are no savings other than your political desire to convince people that there are. Some of you might believe it, your Reform-minded friends will believe it, but those who are doing the research and the studies around this issue know very well there are going to be more costs.

On Bill 104, the education bill, you conveniently talk about attacking trustees, too much bureaucracy, "We need to get these costs out of the way because we need to pass on those moneys to the classroom," but we know even in Bill 104, if there are going to be any savings, they would be very small. But we're not even sure there are going to be any savings as a result of Bill 104.

What Bill 104 does is this: It makes it appear you're doing something, which you label: "We need reform. We need to act. We need change and accountability. We need to get rid of bureaucracy and duplication. We need to get rid of trustees." You think you've done the job, but the active parents in the education system, the ones the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay calls the interest groups, those people who came in front of the committee, were sincerely concerned about what you're doing because they know what you're about to do is to take billions out.

I'm telling you this, and I'm telling those who are watching, that your government, M. Harris and ses amis, wants to take, I argue and predict, up to \$3 billion out of the education system. Why else would they want to centralize education under one roof? Everybody's on to that game except some of you, maybe, if Mike Harris hasn't told you, but I'm sure he did because you need that money for your income tax cut.

You're going to be taking \$3 billion out of the education system and I'm waiting for the day when M. Harris is going to come into this room, into this wonderful chamber, with a straw hat and he's going to start eating it because Mike Harris said, "If I take one cent out of education, I'm going to eat my straw hat." He said, "If I cut one cent out of the health care system, I'm going to eat my straw hat." Mike Harris is going to have to bring

a lot of straw hats because he hasn't been clear with the numbers with us. He's fudging there a little bit, if you know what I mean.

1740

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): A lot.

Mr Marchese: Careful, because you know the Speaker is a tough one here with respect to issues of mendacity or veracity. He's very tough on that stuff. You've got to be careful. Better on the megacity stuff; he will allow me to say whatever I want. I know that.

There are no savings here. It's all about taking money out of the education system. That's why Mike Harris et la compagnie want to centralize it. That's what it's about. Do you think Mike Harris would be doing this if there weren't a way for him to download costs away from the province on to the municipalities? Do you think downloading is nothing but this? Why else would he centralize education? He says that education is a sacred thing, that we've got to deal with that. Of course he's got to deal with that because that's where the money is being taken out, siphoned off to deal with his income tax cut. That's what this is all about. To get the province to come out ahead fiscally he needs to do this and he needs to dump all the services — housing, child care, health care services, welfare — on to the municipalities.

Now the poor taxpayer, who they say is going to get a decrease in his property taxes, is going to find himself with a load he cannot carry because inevitably the costs are going to be high. Speaker, you too in Etobicoke are going to find yourself with a lot of critics because they're going to know the taxes are going to go up. I fully support this motion. I hope everyone else does.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I am pleased to speak to this resolution because it in large part deals with the problems that are confronting the legislature and the people of this province this week: an arrogant government which is moving too quickly and too drastically to fundamentally change the province of Ontario.

It's most noteworthy that the Premier of this province will be addressing the Fraser Institute, that extreme right-wing organization, in British Columbia this Friday. That just fits perfectly, that in fact that's where the Premier's going to be, because that's where these policies are coming from, the extreme right wing. These are not the policies of the Conservative Party of probably the member for Dufferin-Peel when he was first elected to this Legislature. I used to think he was a blue Tory. Today, with this class of 1995, I can assure you the member for Dufferin-Peel is now a red Tory compared to the rest of you, and that is the change I see happening.

I look through the resolution and it deals with the fact that the government is totally ignoring 76% of the people who chose to vote in an election in Metropolitan Toronto and said they didn't want one huge city. If you thought of the Conservative Party and what it always stood for in the past, it used to stand for local government. I used to know, whether I agreed or disagreed with the people, that you could count on the Conservative Party in the old days to be the party of local government, of local accountability, that knew many of the best decisions are made at the local level. This group has decided, under Premier Harris and his advisers who worship at the idol of the Republican Party in the United States — New

Jersey and Michigan, Mississippi, Alabama, you name it, those are the places this government likes. Now they want to have one huge megacity so they can try to control it, so they can have one big council so the richest people can get elected because the larger the unit the more money you need to be elected and the better the chance the Conservative Party would have of formally introducing partisan politics to the municipal level.

The Speaker of the House was a member of Metro council. I'm sure some people knew when he was there that he was a person who supported the Conservative Party; in most cases the Speaker did when he was in Metro council. But they also knew when they elected him to Metro council that of course he was going to act in an independent manner, and he did so, and he was critical of the Conservative Party when he had to be.

Now I see this government trying to centralize, trying to take over the control of education. You set up the straw man there, elected representatives. You say, "We need fewer elected representatives." That means non-elected people are going to have more control, and the larger the units the members of the boards of education must cover, then it's going to be more difficult for them to get elected unless they have financial resources.

The only part of the resolution I have a little bit of trouble with is where it says, "and ensure that community services are in place before hospitals are closed." I'm not here to get into a quarrel with the NDP but I'm going to tell you one area where I do quarrel, and I know that people have varying views. I do not accept the fact that any bloody hospital in the Niagara region has to close. I do not accept that fact. I refuse to go on to the government ground where you argue over, "Yes, we put the money back in the community," "No, we didn't," "Yes, we did," "No, we didn't." We need the hospitals in the Niagara region, and I don't accept that they can close under any circumstances that I see at the present time.

I know that the party that's proposing this isn't looking for widespread hospital closings. I know that is the case. But I worry because some of the people who are most vociferous in the Niagara region and wanting to stop hospital closings are members of the NDP. So I want them to bring the message back to the leader of the NDP about this. It's a personal view. As I say, I don't wish to be partisan but I see this happening and I begin to worry because I don't think the majority of the members —

Mr Christopherson: What does your leader say, Jim?

Mr Bradley: I think I'm on the same line as the member for Hamilton Centre, who doesn't want to see hospitals closed in his area. He and I would agree, and that's where I get worried. I'm not here to attack the leader. I'm here because I'm desperately worried that the opposition is starting to move on to the government ground and that the argument is going to be over, "Yes, he did," "No, he didn't," instead of, "Don't close the hospitals." That's what I'm saying, and I think many people agree with me on that.

Anyway, I saw in today's St Catharines Standard an excellent article written by Josh Dumont, who is a student at Lakeport Secondary School. He says students feel a noose tightening around the neck of education. Let me share this with you because I think it's worthy of concluding my speech with this.

"The students of Ontario are getting the shaft. We are viewed by the provincial government as the fat on a juicy steak that is to be served up to Big Business in Ontario. You see, the Harris government was elected on a campaign promise of a 30% tax cut. And since Big Business makes a lot of money in Ontario, they pay a lot of taxes in Ontario. To make up for the lost revenue created by the tax reduction, the government will have to make cuts in certain areas," such as education and health care.

"Essentially, \$1 billion has already been cut from education. As a result teachers have been laid off, thus increasing class sizes because student populations have not come down as much. Some classes are now between 35 and 40 students in number. Clearly, with 75-minute periods, approximately two minutes of teacher attention per student is all that's available, not taking into consideration lesson time. But it doesn't stop there. There is talk of eliminating 'non-core' subjects such as phys ed, art, music and family studies, some of which are compulsory. But they also want to reduce credit hours from 110 to 90 and cap high school at four years.

"So let's get this straight: we'll have to learn more of less, in less time, with less teacher helping time, in larger classes, so the government can pay for a tax cut which will mainly benefit the rich. Hmm — sounds like a sellout, friends.

1750

"And with the tabling of Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act, the noose around education's neck tightened. The bill establishes the Education Improvement Commission — a small group of people appointed by the Minister of Education to, among other things, 'oversee' the reduction of school boards in Ontario through amalgamation. Of the \$14 billion spent on education, \$150 million is hoped to be saved by amalgamating school boards. However, some experts say it will cost more for the transition to, and maintenance of, this inefficient new system. Besides, studies have shown that only about 5% of the money spent on education is for administration costs. If the 5% means there is local accountability of a school board, then it's worth it.

"School boards must cater to the needs of the local parents and students so as to preserve local democracy. (Democracy doesn't just occur every four years, but requires community involvement.) But with the larger school board districts, the word 'local' can mean half of northern Ontario.

"The government says that between 25% and 49% of education dollars are being spent outside the classroom. Unfortunately, it was the minister himself who defined exactly what is 'outside of classroom.' The list includes, among others, libraries and all of the resources in them, the librarian, the guidance department, your teacher's preparation time, custodial and janitorial services, the education support program (the group which actually writes the curriculum) and 'other instructional supports,' people who are trained to see to the needs of special needs students. How could a school function without even one of these? But the minister is trying to summon disgust in the population of Ontario so there won't be a backlash when he makes drastic spending cuts to pay for the tax reduction.

"Fortunately, people are fighting this insult to education. The Ontario Education Alliance is a good example. But we as students, if we are sufficiently enraged when faced with these facts, must voice our opinions. Maybe we can't stop the government from ruining education in Ontario while they're in office, but we might be able to. Regardless, come next election most of us will be over 18. Then we can give the ultimate political shaft — a vote for a different party, a party which, while in office, will restore the integrity of education in Ontario."

I agree with Josh Dumont.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): In the two and a half minutes I've got left, let me just make three points. First, if this government is truly interested in protecting the quality of education or furthering the quality of education of our students, why doesn't it pass the smaller school size act, Bill 110, that my colleague the member for Sudbury has proposed? That's what will do it, if we're concerned about the quality of education.

The second point is simply: This is the government that in its Common Sense Revolution stated it believes in referendums. It believes the people should have a direct say in the way they're governed and in the decisions that affect their day-to-day lives. What we have in this particular case is 76% of the people who turned out on March 3 in the six Metro Toronto municipalities clearly stated that they don't want a megacity. They're not concerned about a council of 44 people, 57 people, 30 people, 85 people. They want six individual entities, the six existing municipalities with smaller councils of maybe eight to 10 people each that could actually deal with the problems that are involved in the various neighbourhoods.

For the minister to suggest that somehow he has done something about this because he has gone from a 44-member council to a 56-member council and thereby all the problems are solved, he is going in exactly the wrong direction. Because, as my colleague from Scarborough-Agincourt has already mentioned, how do you possibly run a municipal council with 57 different members? It is not going to work, Mr Minister. You know it's not going to work. It says nothing about the quality of the municipalities that we want. It says nothing about the quality of life that people want in the communities. That's what we want councils for. We don't want councils to in effect represent or dictate over an area of 2.3 million people.

Study after study has clearly indicated that larger doesn't make it cheaper and certainly doesn't make it better. From all the presentations that we heard from people who have studied this for years and years, they all came to the same conclusion and that is, once you get a municipality over a certain number of people, over a million people, the cost of running that municipality will actually increase.

Do the right thing, Mr Minister. Withdraw this bill now and do yourself a favour and a favour to the people of Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Mr Hampton has moved opposition day number 4. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. It's a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1754 to 1759.

The Speaker: All those in favour please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Hampton, Howard	Miclash, Frank
Boyd, Marion	Hoy, Pat	Morin, Gilles E.
Bradley, James J.	Kennedy, Gerard	Patten, Richard
Brown, Michael A.	Kormos, Peter	Phillips, Gerry
Carrel, Robert	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Pouliot, Gilles
Christopherson, David	Lankin, Frances	Ruprecht, Tony
Churley, Marilyn	Laughren, Floyd	Sergio, Mario
Cordiano, Joseph	Marchese, Rosario	Silipo, Tony
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	Wood, Len
Gerretsen, John	Martin, Tony	

The Speaker: All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Guzzo, Garry J.	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Hamick, Charles	Palladini, Al
Beaubien, Marcel	Hastings, John	Parker, John L.
Boushy, Dave	Jackson, Cameron	Rollins, E.J. Douglas
Carr, Gary	Johns, Helen	Ross, Lillian
Carroll, Jack	Johnson, Bert	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Johnson, David	Shea, Derwyn
Danford, Harry	Johnson, Ron	Spina, Joseph
DeFaria, Carl	Jordan, W. Leo	Sterling, Norman W.
Doyle, Ed	Kells, Morley	Stewart, R. Gary
Elliott, Brenda	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
Eves, Ernie L.	Leach, Al	Tilson, David
Fisher, Barbara	Leadston, Gary L.	Tsubouchi, David H.
Flaherty, Jim	Marland, Margaret	Vankoughnet, Bill
Ford, Douglas B.	Martiniuk, Gerry	Villeneuve, Noble
Fox, Gary	Maves, Bart	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Froese, Tom	McLean, Allan K.	Wood, Bob
Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia	Young, Terence H.
Gilchrist, Steve	Murdoch, Bill	
Grimmett, Bill	Newman, Dan	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 32; the nays are 61.

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1803.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
174	7452	2	43	close to 370,000 jobs exist in the provincial tourism industry,

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston

Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Chris Stockwell

Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers

**Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of Legislative Services /
Greffière adjointe et directrice générale des Services législatifs: Deborah Deller**

Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Agostino, Dominic	Hamilton East / -Est	L	
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Baird, John R.	Nepean	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre du Travail
Barrett, Toby	Norfolk	PC	
Bartolucci, Rick	Sudbury	L	
Bassett, Isabel	St Andrew-St Patrick	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance, deputy government House leader / adjointe parlementaire du ministre des Finances, chef parlementaire adjointe du gouvernement
Beaubien, Marcel	Lambton	PC	parliamentary assistant (rural affairs) to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Affaires rurales) du ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South / -Sud	ND	deputy New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Boushy, Dave	Sarnia	PC	
Boyd, Marion	London Centre / -Centre	ND	
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	L	deputy opposition leader, opposition House leader / chef adjoint de l'opposition, chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Brown, Jim	Scarborough West / -Ouest	PC	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	L	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Carr, Gary	Oakville South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / adjoint parlementaire du solliciteur général et du ministre des Services correctionnels
Carroll, Jack	Chatham-Kent	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Castrilli, Annamarie	Downsview	L	
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West / -Ouest	L	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre / -Centre	ND	
Chudleigh, Ted	Halton North / -Nord	PC	
Churley, Marilyn	Riverdale	ND	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	L	
Clement, Tony	Brampton South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Premier / adjointe parlementaire du premier ministre
Colle, Mike	Oakwood	L	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North / -Nord	L	
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	L	
Crozier, Bruce	Essex South / -Sud	L	
Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne	London North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North / -Nord	L	deputy opposition House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition
Danford, Harry	Hastings-Peterborough	PC	parliamentary assistant (agriculture and food) to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire (secteurs Agriculture et Alimentation) du ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
DeFaria, Carl	Mississauga East / -Est	PC	
Doyle, Ed	Wentworth East / -Est	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Duncan, Dwight	Windsor-Walkerville	L	
Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet	Durham West / -Ouest	PC	Minister of Community and Social Services / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Elliott, Brenda	Guelph	PC	
Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Fisher, Barbara	Bruce	PC	
Flaherty, Jim	Durham Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ford, Douglas B.	Etobicoke-Humber	PC	
Fox, Gary	Prince Edward-Lennox- South Hastings / Prince Edward-Lennox- Hastings-Sud	PC	
Froese, Tom	St Catharines-Brock	PC	
Galt, Doug	Northumberland	PC	parliamentary assistant (environment) to the Minister of Environment and Energy / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Environnement) de la ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Gerretsen, John	Kingston and The Islands / Kingston et Les Îles	L	chief opposition whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Gilchrist, Steve	Scarborough East / -Est	PC	parliamentary assistant (municipal affairs – urban) to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire (Affaires municipales – secteur urbain) du ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East / -Est	L	
Gravelle, Michael	Port Arthur	L	
Grimmett, Bill	Muskoka-Georgian Bay / Muskoka-Baie-Georgienne	PC	parliamentary assistant (tourism) to the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Tourisme) du ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Guzzo, Garry J.	Ottawa-Rideau	PC	parliamentary assistant (energy) to the Minister of Environment and Energy / adjoint parlementaire (secteur Énergie) de la ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Hampton, Howard	Rainy River	ND	Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Hardeman, Ernie	Oxford	PC	parliamentary assistant (municipal affairs – rural) to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire (Affaires municipales – secteur rural) du ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Harnick, Hon / L'hon Charles	Willowdale	PC	Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif
Hastings, John	Etobicoke-Rexdale	PC	
Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris	Victoria-Haliburton	PC	Minister of Natural Resources, Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre des Richesses naturelles, ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Hoy, Pat	Essex-Kent	L	
Judak, Tim	Niagara South / -Sud	PC	
Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron	Burlington South / -Sud	PC	Minister without Portfolio (Seniors Issues) / ministre sans portefeuille (affaires des personnes âgées)
Johns, Helen	Huron	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health / adjointe parlementaire du ministre de la Santé
Johnson, Bert	Perth	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Johnson, Hon / L'hon David	Don Mills	PC	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, government House leader / président du Conseil de gestion, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Johnson, Ron	Brantford	PC	
Jordan, W. Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement
Kells, Morley	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	PC	
Kennedy, Gerard	York South / -Sud	L	
Klees, Frank	York-Mackenzie	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Richesses naturelles
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	ND	
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	L	
Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Prescott and Russell / Prescott et Russell	L	
Lankin, Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	ND	chief New Democratic Party whip / whip en chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Laughren, Floyd	Nickel Belt	ND	
Leach, Hon / L'hon Al	St George-St David	PC	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Leadston, Gary L.	Kitchener-Wilmot	PC	
Marchese, Rosario	Fort York	ND	
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South / -Sud	PC	
Martel, Shelley	Sudbury East / -Est	ND	
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	ND	deputy New Democratic Party whip / whip adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Martiniuk, Gerry	Cambridge	PC	
Maves, Bart	Niagara Falls	PC	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South / -Sud	L	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East / -Est	PC	
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	L	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	L	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East / -Est	L	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Munro, Julia	Durham-York	PC	
Murdoch, Bill	Grey-Owen Sound	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire du ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Mushinski, Hon / L'hon Marilyn	Scarborough-Ellesmere	PC	Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs
Newman, Dan	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire du ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
North, Peter	Elgin	Ind	
O'Toole, John R.	Durham East / -Est	PC	
Ouellette, Jerry J.	Oshawa	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire du ministre des Transports
Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al	York Centre / -Centre	PC	Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Parker, John L.	York East / -Est	PC	
Patten, Richard	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	L	
Pettit, Trevor	Hamilton Mountain	PC	
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	L	
Pouliot, Gilles	Lake Nipigon / Lac-Nipigon	ND	
Preston, Peter L.	Brant-Haldimand	PC	
Pupatello, Sandra	Windsor-Sandwich	L	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	L	
Rollins, E.J. Douglas	Quinte	PC	
Ross, Lillian	Hamilton West / -Ouest	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement

Member / Député(e)	Constituency / Circonscription	Party / Parti	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services / solliciteur général et ministre des Services correctionnels
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	L	
Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob	Mississauga West / -Ouest	PC	Minister without Portfolio (Privatization) / ministre sans portefeuille (privatisation)
Saunderson, Hon / L'hon William	Eglinton	PC	Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Sergio, Mario	Yorkview	L	
Shea, Derwyn	High Park-Swansea	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire de la ministre des Affaires civiles, de la Culture et des Loisirs
Sheehan, Frank	Lincoln	PC	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	ND	deputy New Democratic Party leader / chef adjoint du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Skarica, Toni	Wentworth North / -Nord	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Smith, Bruce	Middlesex	PC	
Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John	Mississauga North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Education and Training / ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Spina, Joseph	Brampton North / -Nord	PC	parliamentary assistant (small business) to the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism / adjoint parlementaire (secteur petites entreprises) du ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et du Tourisme
Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.	Carleton	PC	Minister of Environment and Energy / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie
Stewart, R. Gary	Peterborough	PC	
Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris	Etobicoke West / -Ouest	PC	Speaker / Président
Tascona, Joseph N.	Simcoe Centre / -Centre	PC	
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General / adjoint parlementaire du procureur général
Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.	Markham	PC	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	chief government whip / whip en chef du gouvernement
Vankoughnet, Bill	Frontenac-Addington	PC	
Villeneuve, Hon / L'hon Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville / S-D-G et Grenville-Est	PC	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Wettlaufer, Wayne	Kitchener	PC	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Wildman, Bud	Algoma	ND	New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim	Simcoe West / -Ouest	PC	Minister of Health / ministre de la Santé
Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth	Waterloo North / -Nord	PC	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Wood, Bob	London South / -Sud	PC	parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire du président du Conseil de gestion
Wood, Len	Cochrane North / -Nord	ND	
Young, Terence H.	Halton Centre / -Centre	PC	parliamentary assistant (colleges and universities) to the Minister of Education and Training / adjoint parlementaire (secteur collèges et universités) du ministre de l'Éducation et de la Formation
Vacant	Windsor-Riverside		
Vacant	Oriole		

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉ PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Administration of justice / Administration de la justice

Chair / Président: Gerry Martiniuk
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ron Johnson
Robert Chiarelli, David Christopherson,
Bruce Crozier, Ed Doyle, Garry J. Guzzo,
Tim Hudak, Ron Johnson, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,
Gary L. Leadston, Gerry Martiniuk,
John L. Parker, David Ramsay, David Tilson
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Rick Bartolucci
Toby Barrett, Rick Bartolucci, Gilles Bisson,
Jim Brown, Michael A. Brown, John C. Cleary,
Morley Kells, Gerard Kennedy, Frances Lankin,
Allan K. McLean, E.J. Douglas Rollins, Frank Sheehan,
Bill Vankoughnet, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

**Finance and economic affairs /
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Ted Chudleigh
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tim Hudak
Isabel Bassett, Jim Brown, Ted Chudleigh,
Joseph Cordiano, Douglas B. Ford, Tim Hudak,
Monte Kwinter, Tony Martin, Gerry Martiniuk,
Gerry Phillips, Gilles Pouliot, E.J. Douglas Rollins,
Joseph Spina, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Franco Carrozza

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Bart Maves
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Julia Munro
Mike Colle, Harry Danford, Jim Flaherty,
Michael Gravelle, Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese,
Bart Maves, Julia Munro, Lillian Ross,
Mario Sergio, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
Len Wood, Terence H. Young
Clerk / Greffière: Lynn Mellor

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Floyd Laughren
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony Silipo
Rick Bartolucci, Ed Doyle, Douglas B. Ford,
Gary Fox, Michael Gravelle, Bert Johnson,
Peter Kormos, Floyd Laughren, Gary L. Leadston,
Frank Miclash, Dan Newman, Peter L. Preston,
Tony Silipo, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Ted Arnott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John Hastings
Ted Arnott, Dave Boushy, Tony Clement,
Alvin Curling, Carl DeFaria, Bill Grimmett,
John Hastings, Ron Johnson, Margaret Marland,
Gilles E. Morin, Sandra Pupatello, Tony Silipo,
R. Gary Stewart, Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Ombudsman

Chair / Président: John L. Parker
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tom Froese
Carl DeFaria, Barbara Fisher, Tom Froese, Pat Hoy,
W. Leo Jordan, Jean-Marc Lalonde, Rosario Marchese,
Bill Murdoch, John R. O'Toole, John L. Parker,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart, Bill Vankoughnet,
Len Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Lisa Freedman

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: Bernard Grandmaître
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Richard Patten
Marcel Beaubien, Dave Boushy, Gary Carr, Brenda Elliott,
Gary Fox, Bernard Grandmaître, John Hastings,
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Shelley Martel, Richard Patten,
Gilles Pouliot, Sandra Pupatello, Derwyn Shea, Toni Skarica
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Smith
Ted Arnott, Toby Barrett, Gilles Bisson, Dave Boushy,
John Gerretsen, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
Gerard Kennedy, Tony Martin, Trevor Pettit,
Lillian Ross, Tony Ruprecht, Frank Sheehan, Bruce Smith
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

**Resources development /
Développement des ressources**

Chair / Président: Brenda Elliott
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Barbara Fisher
Dominic Agostino, John R. Baird, David Christopherson,
Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Sean G. Conway,
Brenda Elliott, Barbara Fisher, Doug Galt, Pat Hoy,
Bart Maves, John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette,
Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker

Social development / Affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Annamarie Castrilli
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Dwight Duncan
Marion Boyd, Jack Carroll, Annamarie Castrilli,
Dwight Duncan, Tom Froese, Helen Johns,
W. Leo Jordan, Lyn McLeod, Julia Munro,
Trevor Pettit, Peter L. Preston, Bruce Smith,
Bud Wildman
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding appears when space permits.

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions paraît si l'espace est disponible.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 1 April 1997

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Education reform	
Mr Martin	7477
Agriculture and Food Week	
Mr Fox	7477
Mental health services	
Mr Ruprecht	7477
Casinos	
Ms Lankin	7478
Agricultural industry	
Mrs Johns	7478
Hospital restructuring	
Mr Bradley	7478
Mr Froese	7479

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Air quality	
Mr Sterling	7479
Mr Bradley	7480
Ms Churley	7481
Ontario public sector salaries	
Mr Eves	7480
Mr Phillips	7480
Mr Hampton	7481

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr McGuinty	7483
Mr Leach	7484, 7485
Mr Hampton	7485
Mr Silipo	7486
Education reform	
Mr McGuinty	7484
Mr Snobelen	7484
Palliative care	
Mr Hampton	7486
Mr Wilson	7486
Mrs Boyd	7486
Ontario Securities Commission	
Mr Phillips	7487
Mr Eves	7487
Education legislation	
Mr Wildman	7487
Mr Snobelen	7488
Lighting Up Ontario	
Ms Bassett	7488
Mr Sterling	7488

Child welfare

Mrs Pupatello	7488
Mrs Ecker	7489

Ipperwash Provincial Park

Mr Wildman	7489
Mr Harnick	7489

Farm retail sales tax rebates

Mr Baird	7489
Mr Villeneuve	7490

Agricultural funding

Mr Hoy	7490
Mr Villeneuve	7490

Highway financing

Mr Bisson	7490
Mr Palladini	7491

Land transfer tax rebate

Mrs Marland	7491
Mr Eves	7491

Services for the disabled

Mr Gravelle	7491
Mrs Ecker	7492

PETITIONS

Municipal restructuring

Ms Castrilli	7492
Ms Churley	7492
Ms Bassett	7493
Mr Ruprecht	7493
Mr Miclash	7494
Mrs McLeod	7494

Georgian Wood Addiction Centre

Mr McLean	7492
-----------------	------

Education legislation

Mr Wildman	7493
Mr Boushy	7494
Mrs Boyd	7494

Premier of Ontario

Mr Marchese	7493
-------------------	------

Government agenda

Mr Bob Wood	7494
-------------------	------

Macassa Lodge

Ms Martel	7494
-----------------	------

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on general government

Mr Maves	7495
Report adopted	7495

Standing committee on social development

Ms Castrilli	7495
Report adopted	7495

OPPOSITION DAY

Government agenda, opposition day motion number 4, Mr Hampton

Mr Hampton	7490
Mr O'Toole	7490
Mr Colle	7490
Mr Silipo	7500
Mr Newman	7500
Mrs McLeod	7500
Mrs Boyd	7500
Mr Grimmett	7500
Mr Sergio	7500
Mr Gilchrist	7500
Mr Phillips	7500
Mr Marchese	7510
Mr Bradley	7510
Mr Gerretsen	7510
The Speaker	7510
Negatived	7510

OTHER BUSINESS

Appointment of House officers

The Speaker	747
-------------------	-----

Time allocation

Ms Lankin	748
Mr Bradley	748
Mr David Johnson	748
The Speaker	748
Erratum	751

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 1^{er} avril 1997

DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

Services en français aux hôpitaux

M. Grandmaître	747
M. Bisson	747

PÉTITIONS

Route 17

M. Lalonde	749
------------------	-----

CA20N

X1

-D23

CA20N
X1
-D23



No. 176A

N° 176A

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 2 April 1997

Mercredi 2 avril 1997



Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 2 April 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 2 avril 1997

The House met at 1333.

Prayers.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): A point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I can appreciate the fact that there may be points of order. If I can just ask the indulgence of the House, would it be okay if we went through members' statements and then I'll go back to Beaches-Woodbine for your point of order?

Ms Lankin: I would appreciate being able to table it now.

The Speaker: That's fine. Member for Beaches-Woodbine.

TIME ALLOCATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your suggestion, but I rise on a point of order under standing order 77(c). Let me start by explaining to you why I have decided to raise this matter at this time and why I have suggested to you that I do it immediately at the beginning of this afternoon's proceedings.

The government has announced its intention to bring forward Bills 103 and 104 for committee of the whole consideration this afternoon. In my view, the committee of the whole consideration of either of these two bills will not be in order. I am raising this matter at this time because you will be required to make a ruling about the propriety of this action this afternoon. It would potentially affect this afternoon's proceedings, which is why I'm raising it now, to give you an opportunity to consider it and so that all members of the Legislative Assembly might be informed about what proceedings will be in order this afternoon.

Standing order 77(c) reads as follows, and I quote: "When a bill that is reported from a standing or select committee is referred to the committee of the whole House, it shall not be taken up earlier than the second calendar day after the referral."

Both Bills 103 and 104 were reported from the standing committees yesterday and ordered for committee of the whole House consideration under the terms of time allocation motions which govern the progress of each bill. This is the first day after the referral. Therefore, unless the standing order has been voided or suspended by the House, these bills cannot be considered until tomorrow.

Motions for time allocation have some history in this assembly, and I realize that time allocation motions routinely suspend particular standing orders. Clearly the government is not in contravention of the rules of the assembly in using the time allocation motion or in suspending particular standing orders as part of the time allocation process.

But in reviewing the time allocation motions, it is clear that the time allocation motions can only suspend the rules of the House under one of the following conditions: when the contravention of the standing order is directly cited, such as the phrase "notwithstanding standing order 9(a)," which appears in the time allocation motion for Bill 103, or when the suspension of the standing order is necessary to facilitate the implementation of the decision of the assembly expressed in the time allocation motion, as I would argue in the time allocation motion for Bill 104 in the paragraph dealing with committee of the whole House, where it does not specifically reference "notwithstanding standing order 9(a)."

The point I'm making is that the time allocation motion in some instances specifically suspends standing orders, as in the time allocation for Bill 103 where it references "notwithstanding standing order 9(a)," the committee, in committee of the whole, may sit beyond the normal adjournment time of the House to finish its business, or when the suspension of a standing order is necessary in order to fulfil the wishes of the assembly as expressed in the time allocation motion.

I would argue that the general "notwithstanding" clause that appears at the beginning of time allocation motions allows for you to consider certain standing orders necessarily to be suspended in order to facilitate the wishes. The example I would give you is in the time allocation motion for Bill 104, where it speaks to the process of committee of the whole and it says that all amendments proposed must be filed by 2 pm on the sessional day on which it is to be considered — and this is the relevant point — "and that the House be authorized to meet beyond its normal adjournment time upon completion of the committee of the whole stage of Bill 104." There it would be necessary if that occasion arose to suspend standing order 9(a) even though the time allocation motion does not specifically say "notwithstanding 9(a)."

I go on to make the relevant point here, which is that in these time allocation motions, in these cases, the motions are silent on the question of whether standing order 77(c) remains in effect. There is no closure clause in the motion to indicate that it is the intent of the House to have the committee of the whole consideration take place the day after either of the bills were reported out of the House.

1340

Again, the motion is silent on the question. Nowhere in the time allocation motion does it say that committee of the whole House consideration must take place on Wednesday, April 2, or on the day after reporting. If the committee of the whole consideration takes place tomorrow instead of today, the will of the assembly expressed

in the time allocation motion is equally implemented but is carried out inside the rules.

I would point out that it is clear that not all standing orders are suspended by a time allocation motion. For example, in third reading debate, under a time-allocated motion —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order. Can I ask the House to come to order? I'm having difficulty — member for Grey-Owen Sound, I'd appreciate it if the House could just come to order. I'm having difficulty hearing the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Ms Lankin: The point I was making is that the specific standing orders that are to be overruled by the time allocation motion either must be explicitly referred to or must be necessary to facilitate the wish of the House as expressed in a time allocation motion. As I have indicated, nowhere in the time allocation motion does it give an indication that it is necessary for committee of the whole to proceed on the day following reporting out of the bill from standing committee nor that that is necessary to accomplish the goals of the time allocation motion.

I was further pointing out that not all standing orders are suspended by virtue of a time allocation motion. For example — and this is just one example; it happens to be a procedural example, but we could look through and find substantive examples — if during third reading of a time-allocated motion there is a motion to adjourn debate or adjourn the House, that motion remains in order; that standing order remains effective.

I recognize that the example I give you is a procedural one, but I would argue that standing order 77(c) to which I refer, which in fact says that consideration of committee of the whole may not take place until two calendar days after being referred out of committee, is in fact a procedural standing order as well, dealing with procedure here in the House.

As a result, it is my position that standing order 77(c) must remain in effect, since there is no evidence that its suspension was considered by the members of this assembly when they voted to approve the motion. There is nothing in either time allocation motion to indicate that suspending this rule and proceeding to committee of the whole consideration the day after reporting would be required. The government's House agenda may well be affected, but their House agenda was not part of the time allocation motion.

Finally, I would pose three questions that I think are germane to answering this point of order.

First, should it not be common practice that when the assembly decides that the suspension of House rules is required for an order of the assembly to be implemented, the absolute minimum number of rules be suspended in order for the will of the House to be carried out?

Second, are all standing orders of the House suspended, including those rules which are not necessary for the time allocation motion to be implemented? I believe I've given examples that would suggest they are not.

Third, who decides which rules are suspended other than the House itself? How can the government House leader or the executive council determine which rules must be suspended when the time allocation motion is the decision of and the property of the entire assembly?

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, on a point of privilege.

The Speaker: The same point of order? A different point of order? A different point of privilege?

Mr Bradley: A different point of privilege on the point of order.

The Speaker: Just give me one second with respect to the point of order.

I am going to take a 10-minute recess. I'll review the point of order offered up by the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Obviously, Mr Speaker, it's my view and the government's view that there is no valid point of order contained in what the member opposite has indicated. The time allocation motion clearly states notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House, and that would include standing order 77(c) as cited by the member for Beaches-Woodbine. Certainly this is a motion that has been phrased in conjunction with the members of the Clerk's department to ensure that it is in order, to ensure that all the standing orders are taken into account. It's my view that the time allocation motion, as it was phrased, as it was voted on by members of this House, is in fact in order.

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): Can I speak to that point of order since the government side —

The Speaker: I haven't recognized the member for Oakwood. With the greatest respect, if you're offering more information on that point of order, I'll be interested in listening. This is not going to be a debate.

Mr Colle: Mr Speaker, just to make you aware of the fact, in committee some of the same points of order raised in terms of the treatment of this bill before the committee of the whole were brought forth to the committee. The committee had proposed a way —

Interjections.

Mr Colle: Anyway, we tried to basically deal with this and we had an amendment at committee that would have possibly dealt with this and what happened is that the government refused to accept the suggested amendment.

The Speaker: Are you talking about 77(c)?

Mr Colle: Yes.

The Speaker: Continue.

Mr Colle: In essence what happened is that because of the time constraints we knew we were going to be under, we thought there would be a way of essentially dealing with this in a proper way. We were told that the House leaders would be dealing with this proposed amendment to get around this problem we're going to have today. I think we're here today because the House leader and the parliamentary assistant on general government refused to deal with this matter at that time. I think it's incumbent upon you to look at this seriously because I think the opposition tried to put this before the assembly properly and wasn't allowed to.

The Speaker: I'll take consideration and I'll be recessing very briefly. Listen, you know what I'm going to tell you today as well is that normally when I say 10 minutes we go to the button of 10 minutes or so. I may take recesses today and be back within that time period.

We may be in for a bit of a long, protracted debate and I would just ask for the indulgence of the members, that it's 10 minutes; if I'm back sooner, I'm back sooner.

ACCESS TO PUBLIC GALLERY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: The reason I want to raise the point of privilege at this point in time as opposed to after you leave or when you come back is that there is a situation in the building where disabled people, for instance, or simply people who have a difficult time with stairs are unable to move around this building because all the elevators have been shut down.

Apparently there's been an anticipation that there's going to be a riotous scene at Queen's Park today with thousands of people. The only place I ever saw that was some speculation out there, as you will know, and you spoke to a group last night that I don't think you found to be a problem. What we're seeing now are security measures which are — that's up to you, I understand that; I don't want to do your job. But for instance, the elevators have been shut down so people can't move up and down. I believe the member for Fort William has another situation similar to that.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): On the same point, Mr Speaker —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): You know if the question you're putting is with respect to the elevators being shut down —

Mr Silipo: No, Mr Speaker, given that you are going to recess for a few minutes, I would ask that you, if you can, take a look at this: I know there were arrangements made to facilitate the attendance of members of the public for this session today and I was there at the meeting last night when you spoke and outlined those. I gather there have been some problems and there may still be, as we are standing here, are sitting here, in terms of people being processed through because I gather initially it was only one person at the desk doing that and that was causing long lineups. I just wonder if you could look into that and see how that can be facilitated.

The Speaker: Member for Dovercourt, I give you my undertaking I will.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): Along similar lines, Mr Speaker, it was of concern that a number of people were standing and waiting, not able to be accommodated. I understand that the tour group which security was waiting for may now have arrived. There still seems to be space in the gallery, and I would trust that anybody who has been kept waiting will now be accommodated in the available space.

The Speaker: Members for Fort William and Dovercourt, I say to you I will give you my undertaking to look after it. I'm doing my absolute best to accommodate as many people as we can. With respect to the security and the accommodation of the folks who would like to come out and see this, it's a difficult job and a difficult task and I think the staff are doing their best.

With respect to the elevators, I'll check that. If they're all shut off, to the member for St Catharines, I'll be certain to ensure that some are started up so that it doesn't inconvenience you for that length of time.

Now, a 10-minute recess.

The House recessed from 1351 to 1401.

TIME ALLOCATION

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I want to thank the member for Beaches-Woodbine, Ms Lankin, for providing me with advance notice of her point of order, as it has afforded me an opportunity to review our precedents on time allocation motions, plus I think it was obviously a well-researched and a very good point of order.

Let me begin by stating that it's important to the House to clearly understand the nature of time allocation. Erskine May has this to say about time allocation orders:

"In many sessions in order to secure the passage of particularly important and controversial legislation, governments have been confronted with the choice, unless special powers are taken, of cutting down their normal program to an undesirable extent, or of prolonging the sittings of Parliament, or else of acknowledging the impotence of the majority of the House in the face of the resistance of the minority. In such circumstances resort is had sooner or later to the most drastic method of curtailing debate known to procedure, namely, the setting of a date by which a committee must report, or the allocation of a specified number of days to the various stages of a bill and of limited amounts of time to particular portions of a bill. Orders made under this procedure are known as 'allocation of time' orders, and...as 'guillotine' motions. They may be regarded as the extreme limit to which procedure goes in affirming the rights of the majority at the expense of the minorities of the House, and it cannot be denied that they are capable of being used in such a way as to upset the balance, generally so carefully preserved, between the claims of business and the rights of debate."

That quote comes from pages 408 and 409 of the 21st edition of Erskine May.

I now want to bring two of our own precedents to the attention of the House. First, in 1992 the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario responded to concerns about the propriety of a meeting beyond 6 of the clock to complete the voting process on clause-by-clause on Bill 40. When the time allocation order, which contained a "notwithstanding" clause, specified the voting process would begin before 6 of the clock but did not specify that it should continue beyond 6 of the clock, the normal adjournment hour specified in standing order 9, Speaker Warner ruled:

"Members must be aware that whenever the House passes a motion of time allocation, that motion in effect is the one that dictates the way in which a bill will be considered at the various stages of the legislative process. The time allocation motion is in effect a standing order on its own merits as regards the piece of legislation to which it is attached. In the matter at hand, therefore, I have no choice but to abide by the terms of that special order."

That ruling can be found on page 2996 of Hansard for October 28, 1992.

Second, in 1993 the Speaker ruled on the orderliness of a time allocation motion that had just been moved on

Bill 47. Various members expressed concern that the proposed motion was at odds with standing order 74. Speaker Warner responded to these concerns by stating the following:

"Indeed, as the member for Parry Sound has stated, standing order 74...would normally be in place. However, I draw his attention to the first line of the resolution, which states, 'That pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order of the House...' So if this resolution which has now been placed before the House is indeed carried, then in fact the resolution states that whatever is contained in the resolution supercedes any other standing order of the House."

The ruling can be found on page 4047 of the Hansard for November 16, 1993.

Turning to the matter at hand, I've carefully reviewed the submissions with respect to standing order 77(c). However, the precedents I have just referred to are definitive and they address exactly the kinds of concerns that the member for Beaches-Woodbine raises. Therefore, I find there is nothing out of order with respect to the concerns that have been raised. Nevertheless, I appreciate hearing from the member for Beaches-Woodbine as well as the other members who spoke to this matter.

With respect to the rules, all those rules necessary to passing the legislation are suspended, all those orders dealing with the legislative process are suspended and it's up to the decision of the Speaker to ensure that it carries on and in fact interprets the motion that came before this House. I thank the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): On another point of order, Mr Speaker, which is related to this House's consideration of Bill 104, the Fewer School Boards Act: I want to table with you a copy of a memo which was made available to me and which I tabled in the standing committee on social development at our meeting in Windsor on March 24. This is a facsimile copy of a memo from Mr Bill Jack, who is a senior official of the Ministry of Education and Training's regional office in London. It is addressed to the directors of education of the four boards in the Windsor-Essex area. This, I remind you, was made available to me on March 24.

If you look at the memo, Speaker, you will see that it is informing the directors of education of a schedule of meetings with Dave Cooke and Ann Vanstone, the co-chairs of the proposed Education Improvement Commission, which is set up under Bill 104 — it doesn't use the word "proposed," however — meetings that were to take place on April 9 to discuss the implementation process for Bill 104. But then in handwriting, signed by Mr Jack, it says, "Please forward the names of the representatives who will attend the meetings described on the attached page" — the attached page sets out the order of meetings. "The deadline for this information is March 26. Please fax this information," and then it gives the fax number of the office and so on.

The deadline that is referred to by Mr Jack was the very day that the standing committee on social development of this Legislature was to consider Bill 104 clause

by clause, yet if you look at the wording of this memo, the ministry officials are in fact assuming that Bill 104 is already in place and that it is to be implemented, and it is making arrangements to implement the bill.

I remind you, Speaker, and all members of the House that Bill 104 has not yet been passed by this Legislature; it is not yet in place. The Education Improvement Commission, of which Mr Cooke and Ms Vanstone are to be co-chairs apparently, is not yet in place. Yet senior officials of the Ministry of Education and Training are operating, I suppose on the instructions of the Minister of Education and Training, as if this legislation is already in place and is being implemented.

In my view, it's a contempt of the committee's work, it's a contempt of the Legislative Assembly and it's a contempt of the legislative process. I ask the Speaker if he would rule on whether this indeed constitutes a *prima facie* case of contempt of the House.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you for the submission, to the member for Algoma. If you'd allow me to take the opportunity of reviewing this and reporting back at a later date, I'd appreciate it.

You're up on a point of order, member for Oakwood.
1410

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): Mr Speaker, as a result of what has transpired in an unusual way, where the amendments have been brought forward for Bill 103 to the committee of the whole today, I think it's appropriate for me to ask you to look at standing order 38(d), which says, "No bill may be introduced in blank or imperfect form."

I wish to raise a point of order in that it says, "No bill may be introduced in blank or imperfect form." According to Black's Law Dictionary, fifth edition, "imperfect" is defined as follows: "As used in various legal compound terms, this word means defective or incomplete, wanting in legal sanction or effectiveness." According to the Oxford Dictionary, "imperfect" means "not fully formed or done," denoting action going on.

Actually, what I am saying here, Mr Speaker, is to bring to your attention that in relation to section 38(d) of the standing orders and the definition in Black's Law Dictionary, it is evident that Bill 103 was introduced in blank and imperfect form. In essence, what we have is a shell, a skeleton of a bill that wasn't really a bill.

I will clarify this for you. First of all, this morning even the Premier himself said: "I don't think this is perfect. I think this is less than perfect." As the architect of this plan and the driving force of this legislation, this admission by the Premier speaks volumes about the fatal flaws of this shell of a bill that was introduced. It wasn't really a bill.

In essence, in introducing Bill 103, what they did is they introduced a white paper. It wasn't really a bill. The proof of that is that what the government is doing is bringing forth almost more amendments than there were sections in the bill.

The Speaker: Can I just take a moment for the member for Oakwood. When they say "in perfect form," it doesn't mean the contents of the bill. What it means is that it's before the House properly. I think what you're deriving is because the content of the bill — you're

looking for perfection. This is first reading. What "perfect" means is that it has come to this House properly. Legislatively, it's before us in a proper, perfect form. That's why you have debate, that's why you send it to committee, that's why you have amendments.

Although you say "in perfect form," it means it can't get here in any form other than the prescribed form that allows us to debate bills. That's where I think you're off the rails with respect to the point of order.

Mr Colle: Can I add something?

The Speaker: You can add something, but it's going to have to be really compelling, because I'm going to tell you that's difficult.

Mr Colle: I think my colleague from Etobicoke-Lakeshore on the government bench even mentioned that this Bill 103 circumvented the normal processes, where bills come from ministries and they're usually brought in through white papers that go out to the public and have discussions. What this bill did is short-circuit that process; it came out of some back room. Therefore, it was really brought to this Legislature without going through the proper processes. The proof of that is all the amendments and the court rulings against this bill that said parts of it were even illegal. I think the —

The Speaker: Member for Oakwood, with the greatest of respect, we're arguing apples and oranges. Where the bill came from, who drafted it, whatever dark room you think it was written in, doesn't have any control over me.

What I have to understand is, is it here properly? It is here properly. Furthermore, if you had concerns about it, this is in respect of first reading. We're now approaching committee of the whole. There's a timeliness to points of order. You should have brought that up at first reading.

Member for Oakwood, I appreciate the point you're trying to make. It's just that I'm not buying that particular point today.

Members' statements.

TIME ALLOCATION

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): On a point of order, Mr Speaker:

I raise this point in a way seeking some guidance from you, because if we get at some point during the day to committee of the whole on either Bill 103 or 104, there is an issue raised in my mind about potential conflict between the one-hour limitation that the time allocation sets out. You've just reiterated for us how that time limitation motion governs now all proceedings on those two bills. Obviously, we accept that as being part of your ruling.

I see a potential conflict between that time of one hour and the potential argument we might want to make, or that in fact even the government might want to make, with respect to amendments that either the government has lodged or we have lodged, about whether those amendments are in order in terms of compliance with the standing orders. I don't have to cite for you what the range of those might be. One example would be where you know very well that under the processes it's not possible to have an amendment that's deemed to be in

order if that amendment amends a different section of the original legislation from one that is amended by the legislation in front of the House.

I'm wondering and I'm seeking from you some guidance as to how and when particularly we are to deal with those issues. The concern I have is this: Is it only limited within that one hour? If the answer to that is yes, if the points of order are only limited to that hour, then does that mean that outside of that, because they're deemed to be put under that time allocation motion, they're deemed to have been moved, there can be no challenge against any of the other amendments we may not reach in any procedural arguments we might want to make within that hour? I seek your guidance.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The member for Dovercourt, that is a superb question, and I expect nothing less, to be honest. The fact of the matter is, the Chair of the committee of the whole will have to rule on that exact point of order that you stood on. I'm sure you will be waiting, as I will and many people, to find out what that ruling will be.

Mr Silipo: Just to be clear, are you saying I should raise that same point at some point during that hour?

The Speaker: Statements.

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: You're on a —

Ms Castrilli: I'm on a different matter, Mr Speaker. I seek unanimous consent of the House to recognize the contribution of Mrs Elinor Caplan, the MPP for Oriole, an outstanding member of our party, who has recently resigned.

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent? Okay. Members' statements. I need a member's statement.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: May I ask for clarification —

The Speaker: That's not a point of order, member for Fort William.

Mrs McLeod: I'd like some clarification.

The Speaker: I appreciate the fact that you'd like clarification. You must seek that from the government House leader. It's not up to me to do that.

I need a Liberal statement. I just want to be clear, if you could please take your seats: I want to now move forward into routine proceedings. I appreciate that you have some points of privilege and points of order.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): Mr Speaker —

The Speaker: Member for Lake Nipigon. I understand that the member for Windsor-Sandwich has a point of order or privilege, I'm sure, one or the other. I will say to the Liberal caucus, I will hear the member for Windsor-Sandwich's point of privilege and then I would ask for a statement to be read. If you're not standing for a statement, I will skip the rotation. Member for Windsor-Sandwich.

RESPONSE TO PETITION

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr Speaker, in terms of order, I guess it's appropriate today, and you'll understand in terms of content why it's

necessary to do it as quickly as possible: It is in regard to standing order 36(h), which is found on page 30:

"Within eight sessional days of its presentation, the government shall file a response to a petition with the Clerk of the House and shall provide a copy of the response to the member who presented the petition."

If I might refresh your memory, it's actually quite brief: The petition content on that date, February 19, 1997, which is well in excess of eight sessional days, was:

"Whereas Ontarians are gravely concerned with the historic \$1.3-billion cuts to base funding of hospitals; and

"Whereas Ontarians feel that health services are suffering; and

"Whereas the government is reducing hospital funding and not reinvesting millions of dollars into the communities that they are being taken away from;

"We, the undersigned" —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I will ask them to respond as soon as they can.

Mrs Papatello: Would I be able to move the matter of lack of response from the Ministry of Health?

The Speaker: No. With the greatest of respect, the member for Windsor-Sandwich, it's been placed. As Speaker I am only allowed to ask the minister to respond. I will alert the minister to the concerns that you've outlined and ask them to respond as quickly as possible.

Members' statements. Member for Fort William.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I appreciate, Mr Speaker, that you've come into the House — I am asking you for an adjudication on an interpretation of your statement on rules of order. It is my intention to seek unanimous consent, which I want to have taken seriously. I heard the ruling you made that you were going to move immediately to members' statements, but I'm not aware of anything — I can't find it in the standing orders — which suggests that a member cannot rise and ask for unanimous consent. I certainly realize it may not be given, but I think I can ask for it.

1420

The Speaker: They rose for unanimous consent. It wasn't there.

Mrs McLeod: I didn't ask for unanimous consent.

The Speaker: No. I appreciate that. Now you want unanimous consent to —

Mrs McLeod: I would like unanimous consent in order to ask to have reviewed a referendum which has been carried out by the students' council in Etobicoke. I ask for this unanimous consent, and I ask government members, who will realize that they are bringing forward presumably this afternoon —

The Speaker: I need unanimous consent —

Mrs McLeod: I'm sorry. I'll be very quick. The government itself has recognized that in Bill 104 they forgot about students. They forgot to consult students —

The Speaker: Member for Fort William, if you're seeking unanimous consent, you must stand, put your unanimous consent; I will put it. If then we have it, we may have the debate that you may be looking for.

Mrs McLeod: Then, Mr Speaker, as I've indicated, I'm asking for unanimous consent that the student viewpoints on Bill 104, which are represented today with a

student present in the gallery who is a representative of the Etobicoke students' council, who have gone to the trouble to express to government their views on their bill —

The Speaker: I get it. I get it.

Mrs McLeod: This is one sentence. I haven't come to a period, Mr Speaker. It's a continuous sentence. If you'll check Hansard, I'm still —

The Speaker: The member for Fort William is seeking unanimous consent for — no? Okay. Statements, member for Mississauga South.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): On April 1, Peel —

The Speaker: Point of order, member for Yorkview.

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I'm seeking your assistance here. In your response to the members for Oakwood and Dovercourt you did say that the bill was introduced in order here into the House. However, in the last few days, after five weeks of public hearings — I'm referring to Bill 103 — we have received —

Interjection.

Mr Sergio: I'm coming to the point of order. We received a number of amendments at the conclusion of the public hearings. Even we, as members of the committee, have had very little time ourselves to see and debate in the proper fashion the amendments which were introduced by the government. Do you have a copy of Bill 103 there, which I want to bring to your attention, Mr Speaker? I want to read from the explanatory note, and I won't read the whole thing, for the convenience of the House:

"The new city, which comes into existence on January 1, 1998, will be divided into 44 wards. The first city council, consisting of one member elected by each ward and a head of council elected by general vote, will be chosen in the 1997 regular election and will take office at the start of 1998."

During the five weeks of hearings the committee members dealt with the bill as it was introduced by the minister into this House, which was the formation of one city composed of 44 members of council.

The Speaker: Mr Sergio, I don't mean to cut you off or speed you up, but I really would like you to get to your point of order.

Mr Sergio: I'm coming to it.

The Speaker: Yes, and Christmas is coming and a whole bunch of other things. I want you to get to your point of order.

Mr Sergio: Thank you for being so patient.

Interjections.

The Speaker: With all due respect to the opposition caucus, I allowed him to get up on a point of order. I am hearing the point of order. I have not heard it. I am allowing him another opportunity to put it. If you could put it, I'd appreciate it.

Mr Sergio: This is Bill 103, and what I have read to you is from the explanatory note of the same bill here. What we have today, what we are faced with today, is a bunch of amendments brought in at the last moment by the minister and the government which are totally different from what was in this particular bill here.

The Speaker: The amendments aren't even before the House yet. With the greatest respect to the member for Yorkview, I'm trying to say to the members opposite — if you could take your seat just briefly, member for Yorkview — the amendments aren't even before this House at this time. You can't ask me to start ruling on amendments that I have not seen. You're bringing forward maybe a very compelling argument, and I'm not suggesting it's not, but the amendments aren't before this House. I haven't seen them, so any argument that you make about any of the amendments is out of order.

Mr Sergio: Mr Speaker, if I may be allowed, the reason I'm bringing this to your attention now is so you can deliver later on at your convenience — that's all I am asking. The amendments have been introduced at the committee level where we had some input, or no input at all; it depends which way you want to see it. Therefore, we are not dealing any more with a council of 44 members; we are dealing with a possible city council of 57 members. I would like to have your opinion on that, so please take your time. Can I have an answer?

The Speaker: Member for Yorkview, I guess my answer stands.

Mr Sergio: Which was?

The Speaker: Which was that I haven't seized the amendments yet. We've got to get to committee of the whole. The committee of the whole House will then seize the amendments and report back to me, the Speaker. At that time it may be very appropriate for you to make your point of order.

Mr Sergio: At what point would the amendments be introduced?

The Speaker: If you want to come down and talk to the table clerks about it, I think they'd be more than happy to outline to you just when that process is.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to request unanimous consent so that the members from all sides of the House may discuss and have a debate about the tremendous contribution made by Citizens for Local Democracy in promoting citizen involvement and public awareness in the democratic process with respect to Bills 103 and 104, timely matters that will be before the House at this point in time.

The Speaker: I would ask for unanimous consent. I heard a no.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to request unanimous consent of the House to permit the government House leader to rise and withdraw Bills 103 and 104 from consideration.

The Speaker: Unanimous consent to withdraw? No.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My point of order is that I have started my statement and I ask you to allow me to continue.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask unanimous consent for the House to consider the concerns raised before the standing committee on social development in consideration of Bill 104 by the boards of Lanark, Leeds and Grenville, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, and Prescott and Russell about the proposal to have only one board in that area despite the

fact that the Sweeney commission had recommended that there should be two boards. I would ask unanimous consent that the House consider and debate that issue today, right now.

The Speaker: The member for Algoma has asked for unanimous consent. No.

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough North): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It's a matter of urgency that the students at York University are losing their year. I'd like unanimous consent of the House to debate and talk and put their views in regard to those students and the professors who are on strike today. I'm seeking unanimous consent in that respect.

The Speaker: Unanimous consent? No.

Let me just say that I appreciate what's going on. If I could make just a quick comment here, I want to say to the members of the Legislature that it's my job to see that this House moves in an orderly fashion. I have, I think with some diligence, tried to respond in the past and today to points of order. After a while, with respect to some points of order, it's kind of obvious what is transpiring.

I think it's important to say to the members opposite that I am prepared to hear a number of points of order and I've heard a number of points of order, but I have a responsibility to ensure that we go through routine proceedings and the House carries forward. I'm going to have to tell you that after a certain number of unanimous consents it seems to me that we now are simply trying to usurp the process. I would ask the members to cooperate and allow the process to continue. There are many avenues that are open to opposition parties for you to accomplish certain proceedings. I would only say to the members opposite that if you could confine yourselves to those, I would greatly appreciate it.

1430

GOVERNMENT MAIL SERVICE

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I have heard a rumour, and it's on fairly good authority I must say —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I've never heard a point of privilege start out with "I've heard a rumour." I'm helping you on this one. Keep going.

Mr Bradley: Glad to see you're helping me.

The rumour is in regard to the mailbox downstairs just outside the mailroom, where you can now have picked up at 5 o'clock any mail that may be going out late in the day, that indeed that 5 o'clock pickup is going to be ended and the earliest we will have it is 9 o'clock the next morning. Since members have some important mail that cannot make it out sometimes in the last load of mail that goes out of our own mailroom, which I think is somewhere around 3 o'clock, it seems to me that our privileges are very much affected by this. I'd like you to investigate —

The Speaker: I will investigate it. Now I'd like to move —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Okay, this is a point of order, and then I'm going to move to routine proceedings.

TIME ALLOCATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I raise a point of order with respect to section 42(f), which deals with time allotment on debates, and I raise this because, given your earlier ruling, we will be proceeding into committee of the whole this afternoon and we will be limited to one hour. Given that you have ruled that all standing orders have been dismissed or overruled by virtue of the time allocation motion, I would like to know whether standing order 42(f) is still in play. It reads as follows:

"The Speaker or the Chair of the committee of the whole House, as the case may be, shall apportion the time available for any matter to be debated or considered under this standing order equally among the recognized parties in the House. The time for a reply by the mover of a motion under this standing order shall be included in the time apportioned to the party of which the mover is a member."

There will be a number of motions, amendments, moved throughout committee of the whole. There is only one hour. I would like to know whether we can expect that that time will be allotted equally or whether this standing order in fact has been overruled by virtue of the committee of the whole House process being referred to in the time allocation motion, and there are a number of other similar standing orders.

I do need to understand because, for example, if I were to move adjournment of the debate during committee of the whole, during that one-hour debate — this is a second point of order, Mr Speaker — would that be in order and would that time then take away from the hour, given that the time allocation motion specifically says "one hour of debate," and a motion to adjourn the debate, therefore the 30-minute bell would be outside of that? If we could have a ruling, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): You know the thing is that that is in reference to opposition days.

Ms Lankin: I raised two points of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: With respect to the first point of order, that has to do with opposition days.

Ms Lankin: There are a number of relevant standing orders and I referred to the standing order that allows for an adjournment of the debate, for example. During the one-hour, time-allocated debate on committee of the whole, is that standing order now suspended by virtue of the time allocation motion? If it is not, I would argue that the very specific nature of the one hour of debate sets it apart from other circumstances.

For example, in the one sessional day being allowed for debate on a bill, if a motion to adjourn the debate is moved, you know that there is a 30-minute bell and that takes away from the time you have available to debate. Given that the time allocation motion very specifically says "There shall be one hour of debate," and it doesn't say that the debate will be concluded in one hour, if this standing order remains in effect, that you are allowed to move a motion to adjourn the debate, does that 30 minutes come away from the hour of debate? I ask you to think about the ruling you made earlier today with respect to standing orders and their remaining in effect

and the specificity of the order of the time allocation motion.

The Speaker: A motion to adjourn would be a motion to rise and report at committee of the whole. You would then rise on a 30-minute bell to report to the House. Whatever the vote is, the vote is. The 30 minutes the bell rang for would come off the hour of the committee of the whole.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Could I just indicate that there could be any number of rulings of possible scenarios that the opposition parties could concoct here this afternoon. I would submit that (a) it should be appropriate to address the questions to the table to get the advice from the Clerk's department; (b) the rulings clearly —

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order, the member for Cochrane South. *Interjections.*

The Speaker: I appreciate your help, members for Kingston and The Islands and Lake Nipigon. Thank you for rising to my defence.

Hon David Johnson: The government is more than willing to take advice and guidance. Then, if a particular situation comes up, when it comes up, that's when one addresses the Speaker or the Chair of the committee. However, if we are to entertain every possible scenario here this afternoon, yes, we can spend the next 12 hours concocting any number. Mr Speaker, I would request that you advise that it's appropriate that those matters be raised when in fact they occur.

The Speaker: No, with the greatest of respect and although I know it raised the hackles to some degree, and I can understand that the comments are controversial, I will ask the member for Beaches-Woodbine —

Ms Lankin: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

The Speaker: You had another point of order. I will hear that point of order, and then I would ask if we could move into routine proceedings. With the greatest of respect, I want to hear your point of order, the follow-up, but there is some merit to the member's comments with respect to the timeliness of points of order. We will get into committee of the whole at some point. Those points of order are probably very applicable at that time and you can make them then, because those are the times when you can get rulings on a lot of this stuff.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Oakwood, I'm not debating this. I said to the member, "At that point in time you may get a ruling on a lot of these issues from the committee of the whole Chair."

Ms Lankin: Mr Speaker, the point of order I want to raise now is with respect to section 47, but I seek your guidance. I understand the plea you essentially just made to the House that these points of order perhaps would be more timely to be raised with the Chair of the committee of the whole House once we move into committee of the whole.

I point out to you, however, that once we move into committee of the whole, we are time-allocated to one-hour debate of many, many amendments. There are some questions that have now been brought to my attention with respect to the rules as a result of your ruling this

afternoon on my original point of order. I seek the ruling from you now so that I know how I may proceed at that point in time and not take time away from the very precious hour that we have for debate, which is unsatisfactory, but I am loath at that point to take any more time away from it.

The point of order with respect to standing order 47, which comes under the standing orders section on motions, reads as follows:

"A motion for closure, which may be moved without notice, until it is decided shall preclude all amendment of the main question, and shall be in the following words: 'That this question be now put.' Unless it appears to the Speaker that such motion is an abuse of the standing orders of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate. If a motion for closure is resolved in the affirmative, the original question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate."

1440

Mr Speaker, I am seeking a ruling from you as to whether this standing order is overruled by the time allocation motion. Would it be in order during the course of that one-hour debate for myself or another member of this Legislative Assembly to move a motion of closure under section 47, and if successful, would that preclude the further moving of amendments and the consideration of those amendments, and by the motion being put forthwith, will there be any calling of the members into the Legislative Assembly to participate in that vote?

The Speaker: First, that's in order, 47; second, it's hypothetical; third, I can't be prepared to start entering into discussions to outline to you at this time what's in order and what isn't in order. I'm certain that if you'd like to discuss this —

Ms Lankin: That would be in order?

The Speaker: Yes, I say it would be in order. If you'd like to enter into discussions with the table clerks on some of the other concerns you have, I give you that option, and even if you wanted to submit them to me now or as the period winds up, I'd be happy to take them then. But I can't even begin to start addressing all the standing orders we have in this place and whether they're in order or not in order. They're all hypothetical. It's very difficult as a Speaker to start answering hypothetical points of order. They have to be concrete and before the legislature and that's why it's very difficult when I say to you it appears to me to be in order, but there's a whole whack of times where —

Ms Lankin: But you understand the hour time limitation.

The Speaker: I understand exactly what you're driving at and I appreciate the point of order you brought up with respect to 77(c), and I think you can understand my response at the time. I can't deal with every hypothetical situation. I'll do my best, and if you have any further questions I'll entertain them at the table or entertain them at a later point. I appreciate your indulgence, to the members of the opposition. I'm going to deal with the member for Parkdale.

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent on a very pressing issue.

The Speaker: I appreciate the member for Parkdale's concern. I think I was fairly clear with respect to unanimous consent. I know you're going to cite the standing order. I am asking for the indulgence of the opposition. It seems to me that I gave the opportunity, that I gave two more chances for unanimous consent. I'll give the member for Parkdale this opportunity but I want to move on after this unanimous consent.

Mr Ruprecht: Mr Speaker, I appreciate that very much. As you realize, the government is planning to cut 253 beds for psychiatric patients.

The Speaker: I need unanimous consent, member for Parkdale. I need you to put it.

Mr Ruprecht: This, as you know, will cause real havoc in the west end of Toronto and in other places. In fact, as you also know, there are four psychiatric hospitals that will be affected.

The Speaker: I need unanimous consent, member for Parkdale.

Mr Ruprecht: Therefore, Mr Speaker, I'm asking unanimous consent to debate this issue of why this government wishes to cut 253 beds in Toronto and four psychiatric —

The Speaker: The member for Parkdale seeks — no? I caution the members of the opposition. I don't want to deal with unanimous consents.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, I'm going to ask you to listen to this one and you may say you don't want to deal with it and I'll accept whatever decision, of course, that you make, but this is a matter of great timeliness. You'll remember there was a discussion about the possibility of proceeding with a piece of legislation dealing with flying wheels — that is, truck safety. What I would like to do, because I think it's very timely today, is request unanimous consent of the House that if we get to orders of the day we deal with the flying wheel legislation or the truck safety legislation.

The Speaker: Unanimous consent on flying wheels? No. Member for Mississauga South.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): This is a member's statement, Mr Speaker.

Interjections.

The Speaker: With the indulgence of the members of the opposition, the member for Mississauga South — if the member for Fort William would come to order — I appreciate the fact that the order was usurped there. I'll be prepared to go back to the beginning. Let's start here. Members' statements. I'm only prepared to go back to the beginning now, though, to the member for Fort William.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): Mr Speaker, on a point of order, before you make the ruling on — I appreciate the fact that you've come loaded for bear today and you've read the rules book as closely as we have. I also appreciate the fact, and I hope you will, that this is not a day for indulgences, with due respect.

The Speaker: I'm going to tell you the rule I'm standing on, Erskine May in Parliamentary Practice, 21st edition: "Speakers have exercised discretion over the taking of points of order and have indicated at what point in the proceedings they are prepared to hear them." That's the one I'm standing on, and I don't want to invoke that. What I really like to do is hear points of order. I don't ever want to cut a member off from a point

of order because I think it's very, very important that they have the right to stand on those points of order, but it's also very important that we are allowed to continue the business of the day.

With the greatest of respect to the members opposite, I think I've shown great discretion in allowing the points of order. It's time now to move to members' statements. Member for Fort William, I will hear your point of order if that's going to satisfy the member for Fort William, but I'd really like to move on at this point to members' statements.

Mrs McLeod: It will not satisfy the member for Fort William, but I'd like to complete it nevertheless. As I indicated when I rose on unanimous consent earlier, I do have a number of issues for which I would like to seek unanimous consent to be considered today, all of which, in my view, are relevant and necessary to be considered by this assembly prior to the final placing of amendments on Bill 104. All of them arise out of the discussion and public presentations we had during the committee hearings on Bill 104. I'm not suggesting that we do anything here which is irrelevant to the debate at hand. I think it's fair for members of the assembly to be able to seek unanimous consent of all members of the assembly to consider an issue that's relevant to the business before us today, and that's simply what I've sought.

In terms of the rules, Mr Speaker — and this is where I'm asking on what basis you're judging. I understand what you've read from Erskine May on rules of order, but I don't know that there's anything there that says that any member of the Legislative Assembly may not stand and seek unanimous consent. It can be denied; it likely will be, given this government's orientation to ram things through. But I don't know that there's anything in the standing orders that allows you, with great respect, to refuse that privilege to me.

The Speaker: I guess because it simply states that with respect to the points of order and the business at hand, it allows the Speaker to move forward within the guidelines of the natural procedures of business.

With the greatest of respect, Fort William, I don't think you're going to agree with me on this one and I can appreciate the fact that you're not, but I've heard your points of order, I've heard the unanimous consents, and I just feel it has been indulged to the point that I think it's time to go to routine proceedings. I understand you don't agree, but that's my ruling.

Mrs McLeod: It's not that I'm not agreeing —
Interjections.

Mrs McLeod: — the rule on my question, and my question is, under what circumstances, under what criteria can the Speaker refuse the right to a member of the assembly to raise a question of unanimous consent?

The Speaker: It's simply a case that it's discretionary of the Speaker. That's the bottom line.

Mrs McLeod: Unanimous consent —

The Speaker: No, it's discretionary of the Speaker to hear a point of order. It's discretionary of the Speaker to move forward from a point of order. Member for Fort William, if you are rising for unanimous consent, you are rising under a point of order. You can't get the floor for unanimous consent unless you stand on a point of order.

Mrs McLeod: Which order in our standing orders? It doesn't refer to —

The Speaker: You see, I don't think we're going to agree on this one; I understand why we're not going to agree. But I'm telling you I have the right to move on when I consider the points of order are now getting in the way of the regular proceedings of the House. I've decided that now. If you want to make unanimous consent, you have to rise on a point of order, and I've made my ruling on the point of order.

Let us, please, go to statements.

Mrs Marland: I have a statement.

The Speaker: No. I'm going back to the rotation. Statements; member for Port Arthur.

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): I have a very important point of privilege, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: No. I'm sorry, sir. I'm in statements and I am now coming back to the Liberal Party and —

Interjections.

The Speaker: All right. On a point of privilege, the member for Port Arthur.

DIVISION BELLS

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is an important point under standing order 21(a), which reads, "Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

Obviously, one of the most important rights of the members of the assembly is the right to vote and certainly the right to be notified that a vote is or will be occurring. This is a fundamental right and I have a point of privilege related to that, in that last night when the bells were ringing for the opposition motion, I was in the legislative precinct, I was in my office and quite frankly I could not hear the bells. The bells were not ringing in my office and I recognize that therefore —

Interjections.

Mr Gravelle: I recognize that my colleagues frequently have bells in their offices, and it seems to me that it is my right to be notified of the vote and one of the privileges of access of service is that the bells will ring within the legislative precinct and the office.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): That's a good point.

Mr Gravelle: It's a very good point, because what it puts at risk obviously is that I cannot fulfil my duties if I'm not notified or able to know that a vote —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I agree with you and I will undertake to investigate that and get the bells fixed. Statements.

1450

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE NORTH

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): Despite an unemployment rate of 11.4% and an even higher youth

unemployment rate of 22% in northern Ontario, the Minister of Northern Development continues to kill jobs and cancel work training programs geared to the special needs of the north.

Take the minister's recent decision to restructure the activities of resident geologists and his ministry's mining recorder offices. While prospecting activity in northern Ontario continues to boom, this minister has eliminated key professional staff in those areas and has forced the consolidation of activities in one community. While prospectors are working hard to ensure continued growth for Ontario's mining sector, the minister has threatened their ability to access service and information quickly, thereby forcing a drag on prospecting activity in the north.

Clearly, this minister's action speaks more to the need to satisfy Mike Harris's downsizing plans than the long-term economic health of northern Ontario and its people. Even more distressing, the minister continues to waffle on the fate of two northern youth job training opportunities. He has refused to renew funding for the Junior Rangers program, a program that gives high school students direct involvement in environmental conservation. He has also refused to confirm funding to the Nortop program, which last year created 3,000 jobs for youth in northern Ontario.

Minister, after a year and a half, northerners expect some action by this government on the unemployment crisis in northern Ontario. Do the right thing. Give your people a hand up by maintaining support for these important northern programs.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): It's a sad day when citizens feel they have to take legal action to protect themselves against their government. That's what a group of citizens did the other day at a press conference here at Queen's Park.

George Stephenson and Chris Wilson, the co-chairs of the Citizens Legal Challenge, and Bob Barnett, Beth Moore Milroy, Graham Mudge, Andrew Vance, the other members of the steering committee, announced their formation of the Citizens Legal Challenge just yesterday. Raj Anand is the former head of the Ontario Human Rights Commission. He was retained as the legal counsel.

This group has been incorporated to take legal action on behalf of citizens and citizens' organizations to have Bill 103 struck down if this government is foolish enough to try to pass it into law over the objections of the vast majority of Toronto's citizens.

Action will be brought under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on the basis of reduced access to representation which will result in reduced freedom of expression for Toronto's citizens. The details of this challenge will be made public at the time if the government makes it necessary to launch this action. George Stephenson said this about this bill: "The megacity proposal is not just flawed, it is terrible — and it is anti-democratic."

Four reasons for the challenge are loss of community and loss of accessibility and accountability from elected representatives; related legislation such as downloading

and Bill 104; lack of any clear or substantive reasons for the megacity; and the lack of process. George Stephenson says: "The government may try to close down our cities. But they won't close us down."

If you want to support the group, contact George Stephenson at 922-2951.

COMMUNITY CARE ACCESS CENTRES

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): On April 1, Peel's Community Care Access Centre, or CCAC, opened its doors after much time and effort by the volunteer members of its board. The CCAC provides one-stop shopping for seniors, persons with disabilities and others who need long-term care.

Before the CCAC opened, residents of Peel had to call several agencies and government offices to arrange long-term care such as residential placements, visiting nurses, housekeeping and Meals on Wheels. Now just one phone call is needed and the CCAC will coordinate a wide range of long-term services.

This is a great step forward in the history of Peel, and on behalf of the beneficiaries of the CCAC I would like to express gratitude to everyone who has been a part of making this happen. Other communities in Ontario are also benefiting from the hard work of Peel's CCAC board, whose excellent business plan is serving as a model for CCACs that are still in the planning phase.

For 10 years Ontarians have talked about the need for meaningful long-term care reform. With the CCACs and our other changes, the Mike Harris government is delivering long-term care reform that puts patients and their families first in Peel and across Ontario.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Prescott et Russell) : Les gens de Prescott et Russell de la région d'Ottawa-Carleton et tout le comité SOS Montfort ont démontré qu'ils n'allaient pas accepter la recommandation de la fermeture de l'hôpital Montfort sans se défendre. Le 22 mars dernier, plus de 10 000 personnes se sont rassemblées au Centre municipal d'Ottawa pour manifester leur appartenance à l'hôpital Montfort. Des jeunes, des personnes âgées, des francophones et des anglophones de partout en Ontario ont pris part à ce ralliement monstre.

Ce fut un grand ralliement pour illustrer que la commission n'a pas pris en considération la formation professionnelle qui se fait à Montfort ; que la commission a fait erreur concernant les données de la clientèle francophone de Montfort ; et qu'elle n'a pas considéré l'apport de Montfort au sein de toutes les communautés francophones de la province.

Nous voulons conserver Montfort pour éviter un autre «Rapport Dubois», qui a mis à jour au début des années 70 une situation troublante qui existait dans les murs de l'institution psychiatrique de Brockville. Des francophones avec un retard intellectuel en résidence au sein de cette institution étaient évalués comme étant moins intelligents parce que le personnel anglophone n'arrivait pas à les comprendre et à communiquer efficacement avec eux.

La fermeture de Montfort, c'est un retour en arrière. C'est ouvrir la porte à d'autres rapports comme celui du docteur Dubois.

Monsieur Harris, les Ontariens sont fiers de leur passé, mais ils ne veulent pas retourner en arrière. Ils veulent foncer vers l'avenir. Montfort est un outil indispensable pour poursuivre —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Member for Beaches-Woodbine.

AMENDMENTS TO GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I was pleased today to join with my leader, Howard Hampton, and the members from Dovercourt, Fort York, Riverdale and Algoma as we tabled our amendments to Bill 103 and Bill 104 with the Clerk of the House.

We tabled approximately 11,500 amendments to Bill 103. Every one of those amendments deals with a very serious issue that we heard during the public hearings on Bill 103. They deal with iron-clad protection of existing municipal reserve funds; enhanced community control over such issues as planning, licensing and arts; continued statutory establishment of the Toronto Transit Commission; guarantees of full consultation with the public in the implementation of any changes in provincial regulation or new bylaws; a reasonable \$200,000 spending limit for mayoral election campaigns — I could go on to describe that.

With respect to Bill 104, the amendments include a clear delineation of new district school boundaries based on what was presented to the standing committee; the children's bill of rights that was developed by Toronto parents and presented to the committee by the Toronto Board of Education. It's an effort to limit the damage of the Tory cuts in this bill and outlines the necessary components of quality education.

There will be thousands and thousands of amendments that we will be dealing with in committee of the whole, serious amendments. I urge the government to take the time to work through those with us in a reasonable fashion and improve those amendments.

CHILD SAFETY

Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South): I rise on behalf of the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services to join with police services across Ontario to proclaim April as Stay Alert, Stay Safe Month. Children's safety is everyone's responsibility. Specifically, street-proofing continues to be essential to children's daily education. Adults should teach children to listen to their instincts and help them to gain the confidence to handle potentially dangerous situations.

In light of recent revelations, it's particularly timely that this year's theme is called "Keeping Team Sports Healthy and Fun." We are proud to join with crime prevention committees of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the federal Solicitor General, the Canadian Tire child protection foundation and our colleagues in the other provinces for their endorsement of this effort of the Stay Alert, Stay Safe organization. I'm

sure that I join with all members in congratulating them, and we wish them much success in their work.

1500

MEMBER'S STATEMENT

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I hope you will find this is indeed a legitimate point of order and that it is a very timely point of order. I see that you've had a discussion with the table clerk and that you may understand what is coming forth. I would point out that the member of the government caucus who just rose and delivered a member's statement is a parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services. In the opening of his member's statement he made reference to the fact that he was making the statement on behalf of the minister.

Mr Speaker, I would point out to you that the rules are very clear around members' statements and what they can be used for and who can deliver them, and it is completely out of order for a parliamentary assistant to rise and deliver a member's statement with respect to his portfolio and on behalf of the minister with whom he works. I believe there has been another example of the government being flagrant in regard to the rules of this House, proceeding in such a way as to ignore the rules of this House. This is not the first occasion on which we have seen the government behave in this manner.

I believe it is important that you make a ruling but also that you offer for members of the opposition some suggestion of redress, because as this continues, as we continue to see flagrant abuse of the rules of the House by an arrogant majority government, we on this side are left always to come to you after the fact to seek a ruling, always to wonder what possible redress there is. There appears to be consistent behaviour on the part of government members, and I would ask that you both rule and please offer for us a manner of redress, and a stern redress, with respect to the behaviour of the members of the government caucus.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: This is an extremely important matter. You will know that members of the assembly, on this side at least, have risen many times to say, "Is a minister going to make a statement?" At 12 noon, the government, as a courtesy, informs the opposition of ministerial statements so that we are able to at least have our critics here and perhaps prepare for potential statements.

If the government is going to try to avoid that process of having its ministers make statements in this House publicly, informing the House and members of the press gallery of new government policy, then it seems to me this is indeed an attempt to circumvent the rules of the House. I believe you may want to take some time to consider this matter and make a ruling, or perhaps you can make a ruling at this time.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): There is no intent to circumvent any rulings of this House. It was simply a matter that one of the members of the Legislature was to make a statement. In the absence of

that particular member, I think the parliamentary assistant did make the statement in his stead. I'm not sure if the rules have been violated or not. I can assure you there was no intention to circumvent or violate any particular rule. I would certainly leave, as always, the ruling in your good hands, Mr Speaker, but indicate to you that it was simply an intent of a member, not pertaining to the Solicitor General or the Attorney General, to make a statement in this Legislature.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): In light of the government House leader's comments, I think it is incumbent upon the Speaker to rule that each of the opposition parties should have their normal five minutes' rebuttal in response to the minister's statement. The parliamentary assistant made a statement on behalf of his minister, a ministerial statement in essence. Therefore, the opposition parties should have the opportunity, under the rules, to give their responses.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Could I just say quickly to the member for Algoma that can only be done through consent.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I'll hear that one. I'm fairly sure of that.

The other thing is, you know what? That probably is more my fault than anyone else's. I should have been listening more carefully to the member for Oakville South. It is my responsibility.

Mr Gary Carr (Oakville South): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I can explain the situation. The statement was supposed to be done by my colleague the member for Wellington. He had to step out because of the delay. As you know, we usually do this at 1:30. He had to leave, so in his absence I did the statement. If it offends anyone, I will certainly apologize, and I did on behalf of the member for Wellington, so that you understand what that was all about.

Ms Lankin: Point of order, please.

The Speaker: With respect to the member for Beaches-Woodbine, what the member for Oakville South said doesn't change anything. Although I appreciate the point he has made — he is an honourable member, as is the member for Wellington, and I take them at their word — it is my responsibility. I missed it. I have to be more vigilant in the future in listening to statements. This is a government statement. I ask the opposition to accept that. I cannot seek to allow more time to one side or the other. That must come through unanimous consent. I will give you my undertaking in the future that when the statements are made, I will be more vigilant in listening to them.

Ms Lankin: In light of the error, in light of the apology from the member, in light of the concern raised by the government House leader that there was no intent and in light of the fact that it was clearly stated that this was being made on behalf of the Solicitor General, I would ask for unanimous consent for five-minute responses from the two opposition parties to this ministerial statement.

The Speaker: Unanimous consent to five-minute responses? I heard a no.

I have a point of privilege for the member for Fort William.

ACCESS TO PUBLIC GALLERY

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): I've been trying to follow as closely as I can what is happening in terms of the accommodation of members of the public who are here to observe today's proceedings. I was given to understand that nobody could be seated in this gallery until 3 o'clock because it was being held for tour groups. It is now well past 3 o'clock. There are at least 200 people who want to be accommodated in the assembly chambers. I'm glad to see that a few members of the public have been accommodated, but I fail to understand why the galleries are not full.

I also understand that you need some sort of a numbered pass today in order to get into the public galleries. I don't know whether members' offices were advised that we would have to provide numbered passes. A number of us have signed members' gallery passes and obviously the members' gallery is full, so we have people who are simply not —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I appreciate the point you are making. Why there are numbers is because there were so many people. As you arrived, you got a number; if the gallery freed up, you were the next person allowed to go up. That's the only reason for the number.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Please, just give me a moment.

Also, I don't know how long they are running the tours through the public gallery. I met with the people with respect to the tours. I believe the tours were to be done today. They're done, so now they're processing them and they will be in, I think, as soon as they're processed through the metal detectors upstairs and allowed to come in.

The numbers have nothing to do with any particular new efficiencies we put in place. It's simply a case that if you were the second hundred people here, you get the first opportunity to move into the public galleries.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): Point of privilege, Mr Speaker.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): On a point of order.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): Point of privilege.

The Speaker: Point of privilege, member for Windsor-Sandwich.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor-Sandwich): Thank you, Mr Speaker. This is particularly important, given the time and the day, today being Wednesday, and, as an official member of the Legislative Assembly committee, I've been informed as I arrived in the House again today, just this afternoon, that the Legislative Assembly committee has been cancelled once again.

The relevance for your address in terms of my own privileges as a member, Speaker, is that you are quite aware of all of the shenanigans put forward of late by the government members at that committee. In fact, we had to come to your aid in terms of how we could ask some of these —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I've got to tell you something. I have to tell the member for Windsor-Sandwich committees have nothing to do with me. The cancellation of committees, whether they go off or whether

they don't go off, they're not a point of privilege. I will hear very, very briefly your point of privilege, summing up.

Mrs Papatello: The issue, of course, is around referendum, which is around legislation which is due supposedly to be brought into the House. Because that has been the only item on an agenda for that committee of the Legislative Assembly, the concern I have is that — and this is the history: February 26, the legislative committee was cancelled —

The Speaker: I need to hear your point of privilege. I need to hear it right now.

Mrs Papatello: As a member of the House and certainly as an official member of the Legislative Assembly committee dealing with the issue of referenda at committee, my privileges then are to participate fully in the process of getting through the supposed time frame of having legislation brought forward into the House dealing with the issue of referenda.

Apparently the cancellation of the Legislative Assembly committee meetings has been timed with the vacations of certain members of that committee, as opposed to when I, as a member, have the privilege to work on behalf —

The Speaker: I appreciate that, but it's not a point of privilege for the Legislature. It must be taken up with the committee.

Members' statements.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order, member for Renfrew North.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Scarborough East. Thank you.

We have about three points of privilege and one point of order. What I'm looking at is, do they have anything to do with the ones that I just dealt with or are they new? They're new?

Member for Lawrence.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): I would like to refer back to the original time allocation motion where the House leader put the motion "That upon receiving the report of the standing committee on general government, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith."

1510

This refers, of course, to section 47, the clause that deals with closure motions: "'That this question be now put.' Unless it appears to the Speaker that such motion is an abuse of the standing orders of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority...."

I'm going to argue, with respect to the extent that one hour is all that is being granted for consideration of amendments, that there is an infringement of the rights of the minority.

The Speaker: It has been passed by the House, member for Lawrence. It has been adopted by the House. You can't appeal to me a motion that has been adopted by the House.

Mr Cordiano: But there is clearly in section 47 —

The Speaker: Member for Lawrence, I ask you to take your seat.

Mr Cordiano: I'm asking for clarification.

The Speaker: Clarification isn't a point of order. A point of order is a point of order, and the point of order is out of order. It has been adopted by the House on a motion for time allocation. That was adopted by this House. If you had a point of order, you should have taken it up at that time. It's not timely.

Mr Cordiano: But the point I'm trying to raise is with respect to the amount of time —

The Speaker: Member for Lawrence, it doesn't matter. That debate has taken place long ago.

MEMBER'S STATEMENT

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): I want to raise a point of order with respect to the statement that was made on behalf of the Solicitor General. I appreciate the point you made earlier, that you could not of your own volition ask for unanimous consent; that in fact that was something to be decided by the House. But I believe it was deemed to be a ministerial statement. I believe the government House leader admitted on the record that it was a statement made on behalf of the minister. I'm assuming that at the very least, when we get to ministerial statements we will either have the statement repeated by the minister or at the very least you will allow at that point in time, as the rules provide, responses by the two opposition parties.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I appreciate the point of order. I did not hear the minister say they deemed this to be a ministerial statement.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Mr Silipo: You might want to clarify that with him, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Member for Dovercourt, the government House leader can stand at any time and clarify anything he likes to. I didn't hear that, with the greatest of respect. That's all I can tell you.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): He spoke on behalf of the minister.

The Speaker: I didn't hear him say that was a ministerial statement. Government House leader?

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): It clearly wasn't a ministerial statement. I indicated that the member was speaking on behalf of the member for Wellington.

Interjections.

Hon David Johnson: Absolutely. I said it; I should know. I should know what I meant. You've made your ruling on this particular matter, Mr Speaker, so I would submit these are out of order.

Mr Silipo: Speaker, with all due respect, the ruling you made dealt with whether we should be —

The Speaker: Member for Dovercourt, I did hear your point of order. Your point of order is that the government House leader said it was a ministerial statement. I didn't hear him say that, with the greatest of respect for the member for Dovercourt. I suppose you heard it one way and I may have heard it another. I didn't hear those words come out of his mouth. I appreciate your point of order, but since I didn't hear it that way, I don't see it as a point of order. Now, we've got a statement.

Mr Silipo: May I just then ask, Speaker —

The Speaker: Sure, go ahead, but very quickly.

Mr Silipo: May I just ask very quickly what happens if upon reviewing Hansard you do in fact find that the member, when he made the statement, said, "On behalf of the Ministry of the Solicitor General," the member himself? He's still sitting here, so you're able to verify that now. I suggest it would be appropriate for you to do that.

The Speaker: I did hear the member for Oakville say that. I did not hear the government House leader say it was a ministerial statement. I did hear that, member for Dovercourt.

Mr Silipo: Surely, Speaker, nobody stands up and says, "This is a ministerial statement"; they stand up and say, "On behalf of the ministry." It's the same thing.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): You said you missed it.

The Speaker: No, I heard the opening remark, to the member for Lake Nipigon; I did not hear the whole process.

I understand the points of order you're putting. I thought you said the government House leader said it was a ministerial statement. I did not hear the government House leader say that.

Mr Silipo: The member himself is still there.

The Speaker: The member for Oakville South can stand and say what he said. I have not got Instant Hansard. I can't recall exactly what he said.

Mr Silipo: But you can ask him. He's right there.

The Speaker: It's not my job to go around seeking out this information.

Mr Silipo: Sure it is. It's part of your job for keeping order.

The Speaker: No, it's not. It's up to them to decide whether they want to put it forward.

Mr Wildman: So your position is that when the member for Oakwood says something, it doesn't really count.

The Speaker: No. Can I have a statement from —

Interjections.

The Speaker: I say to the opposition members, I'm at the point of points of order; this is the last point of order. I'm at the Liberal — I'm sorry, I should hear yours. There are two more points of order and then I'm going to look for a statement from the Liberal Party. If it's not there, I'm moving on. The member for York South.

ACCESS TO PUBLIC GALLERY

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I rise on a point of privilege. You have shown some sensitivity to the fact that we are being careful about our privileges today in the face of a government that wants to stifle debate, that's trying to hide from all the public by stuffing the debate into one hour.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I know, but you know what? Points of privilege aren't speeches. I need a point of privilege.

Mr Kennedy: The point of privilege I'm asking you to rule on is with regard to statements you made in the media surrounding the circumstances today, specifically

statements made on CBC about the preparation of plans in anticipation. I think you can appreciate that for the members of the opposition, the minority members of this House, we want to make sure there aren't any arrangements arising — and we think inadvertently because I think we appreciate the sensitivity you've shown. But we would like to know whether or not you would agree that any plans made in anticipation of today's proceedings on behalf of yourself and the table officers should be tabled in this House so we know what arrangements will be made concerning this debate, concerning perhaps some of the rulings and so on —

The Speaker: It's not a problem. I'll be happy to table the plans we've done and the meetings that have taken place and what we've agreed to to accommodate the people who come down here. I'd be very happy to do that, and as soon as we get it, I'll be happy to put it on the table. I will do my best to get it to you as soon as possible, but it's a very simple and straightforward operation.

I'm looking for, member for St Catharines, a statement.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, I do have a point of order and it is —

Interjections.

Mr Bradley: — being rudely interrupted by members of the government. You might even believe it's a point of privilege, but I believe it's a point of order because it relates to legislation coming before the House, and that is, despite your words — I'll put it that way; I won't put them any other way — of caution — I'll put it that way — despite the personal opinion you expressed about government advertising, the two bills we have on the docket this government is bringing forward — Bill 103, the megacity bill, and Bill 104, the education bill — both of those are still being subjected to government advertising. We still have the Premier on television on almost a daily basis, perhaps more, extolling the virtues of what the government is doing. This is a point of order.

The Speaker: Let's hear it.

Mr Bradley: The point of order is, how can we possibly proceed with this legislation when, unfairly, the government is using all of its resources, the taxpayers' dollars, millions upon millions of dollars, to have the Premier extol the virtues of this legislation when the opposition does not have the same opportunity?

The Speaker: I don't see that as a point of order. Statements. The member for Fort William.

STUDENT REFERENDA

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): In the gallery today is Scott McDonald, who is here representing the Etobicoke students' councils. The Etobicoke students' councils have just organized a referendum among all the secondary school students in Etobicoke on their views of both Bill 103 and Bill 104. I am not surprised, but I'm pleased to report to the House that 80% of the almost 4,000 students who participated in this referendum were opposed to Bill 104 and specifically to the amalgamation of Toronto's seven school boards into one mega-board, and 78% of those students were opposed to the creation of a new megacity.

I'm sure that every member of this assembly would have to agree that students are the ones who are most directly affected by the changes to education this government is ramming through, but this government does not care about the students any more than it cares about the views of teachers or trustees or school board employees or the hundreds and hundreds of parent groups that have made representation of their concerns to the committee hearings on Bill 104.

I have, just as an example of one of the few students who got a chance to make a direct presentation to our committee hearings, the views of Kazia Picard, a Thunder Bay student. Here's what Kazia Picard says:

"I may not have the legal right to make my vote according to these issues, but I do have a right to a fair and equal education.... I am here desperately trying to keep my education from dissolving into a system where the gap between the...government's and the students' reality is so wide that the government does not understand what is going on."

These are the views of —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Statements. I'm going to go to statements, finish, and then I'll come back around.

1520

HOSPITAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): Last Thursday I was down in Pelham when the hospital restructuring steering committee of the Niagara District Health Council released its final report. They have the nerve to call it Made in Niagara. Made in Niagara, my foot. This plan to shut down hospitals like the Hotel Dieu, and to gut hospitals like those in Grimsby and Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie and Port Colborne — gut them — wasn't made in Niagara. It was made in the Premier's boardroom. It was made in the back rooms of the private, for-profit, corporate health care providers that are lined up at the Peace Bridge.

I'm telling you, they're lined up at the Peace Bridge, ready to provide American-style, for-profit corporate health care and this government with its agenda of shutting down and gutting hospitals in Niagara and across this province is writing them a blank cheque. It is gutting our public health care system and the people of Niagara know it.

The Niagara hospital restructuring steering committee quite frankly didn't listen. There wasn't a single voice of support. I've got a box, a rather big box, of thousands and thousands of messages that same steering committee refused to accept that I'm going to be presenting to you right here and now today: People like Ada Werner who says: "Are they trying to tell seniors to just lay down and die? We paid our way for many years"; people like Bonnie Trudell who says: "We need Hotel Dieu for chemical radiation and fallout. Thanks to them, I'm a survivor."

EPILEPSY

Mrs Helen Johns (Huron): Every year, two months are selected to heighten public recognition and under-

standing of epilepsy. March was Epilepsy Awareness Month and many workshops, public forums, displays and social events were held by local chapters throughout the province to bring public awareness to epilepsy in their area. Epilepsy Ontario has been dedicated to helping people with epilepsy break down the barriers associated with this condition and to assist researchers in the search to find a permanent cure.

More than 280,000 Canadians have epilepsy. There are over 14,000 new cases reported each year, 18% of them in children and adolescents. It appears without warning in all races and at all social levels. It can cost thousands of dollars every year for medical care, medication and lost earnings, not to mention the costs extracted by the fear, misunderstanding and lack of information that brings isolation and anxiety.

In August, volunteers from epilepsy associations throughout Ontario sell gladioli, the floral symbol representing epilepsy. I would encourage everyone to purchase some, so that we can renew hope to all children and adults living with epilepsy.

ACCESS TO PUBLIC GALLERY

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: It is now some 15 minutes plus since you assured me that people were being seated in the galleries. There are some 16 people who have been seated in the last 15 minutes. I don't know if you're strip-searching them up there or what you're doing, but it's just unconscionable. These people have been kept waiting now for two hours. They're still being kept waiting and the gallery is empty.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): From what I understand, the metal detector broke upstairs. Member for Fort William, with the greatest of respect, I understand that you would like to see the galleries up there full because they've come down to see this place operate. There are other issues involved with respect to security and processes that I'm doing my best to maintain, and it's a difficult job. We've had a breakdown in the metal detector. We're trying to process them as quickly as we can.

Interruption.

The Speaker: I ask the gallery to come to order, please. Thank you. There is no benefit for me that the galleries wouldn't be full. It does not make any sense for me to keep them out. I'm doing my best to make sure it gets handled. It's also very difficult while I'm sitting here to ensure that the process is working.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: No, I'm not going to entertain any points of order or adjourn the House, so —

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): Could I suggest that in light of the security reasons, perhaps there should be a recess until you could probably secure the —

The Speaker: I think it's better that we maintain and move along rather than recess the House. I appreciate it. It's now ministry statements.

Mr Kormos: Point of order.

The Speaker: Members on the opposition, I appreciate you want points of order and points of privilege. With

respect to the people coming into the galleries, I can tell you we're doing absolutely everything within our power to ensure it happens as quickly as possible. I understand that you may be trying to help, but if there is anything you can do, I will come to you and ask for your assistance as soon as that happens.

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: One of the hallmarks of this Parliament as compared to so-called governments in other parts of the world is that it has to be, it's imperative that it be, public and open and accessible to the public. How dare we sit when people are barred from entering the half-vacant gallery? It's repugnant to the —

The Speaker: Member for Welland-Thorold —
Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Lawrence, I appreciate your assistance. I am not, nor is anyone being barred from the gallery. Member for Welland-Thorold, I appreciate the fact they're not there. I have inquired at great length to try to speed the process up. Nobody is barring anybody. I don't want to see anybody not be in here who wants to be in here, and I'm doing my best from the chair to ensure that is happening. It may take a little bit more time. I beg for your indulgence. Recessing the House won't assist the matter at all. I appreciate your help.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My point of order relates to a report and I think you were in the chair when it was asked for and not provided to members of this House. I don't know whether you or the table could assist us, but you'll remember that the Solicitor General was refusing to present to the House a report on the involvement of organized crime in the gambling sector in this province, and before the government was to proceed with its VLT legislation, where it was going to put VLTs in every bar and every restaurant on every street in every neighbourhood in every town and village and city in Ontario, we were to get a report from the government, the CSIS report, I believe it is, or something similar at the provincial level, an OPP report on organized crime involved in gambling.

I have yet to see this House have access to that particular report and I'm wondering if you could help us out in the opposition —

The Speaker: I think that sounds like a better question than a point of privilege, to the member for St Catharines.

Interjections: Point of privilege.

The Speaker: I have a whole series of points or privilege, and I see six. Let me take those — seven. Let me take those and we'll move directly into question period after that. Member for York South.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): Mr Speaker, it's just related to the earlier point of privilege I raised, and pursuant to some of the points raised since around concerns around today's arrangements.

I'm wondering, given your concurrence that that's relevant information for us to sustain our privileges as members, the provision of information about the preparations, the plans you made around today's conduct of the Legislature and related things, if we could recess until that information became available so that we would know we would have that information —

The Speaker: That's not a point of privilege. I never ruled that it was a point of privilege that has in fact usurped your ability as a member to perform your duties in this House. I never made that ruling. All I'm suggesting to you is that I will table that information, and that was it.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): Mr Speaker, this is a point of privilege, and just to refresh your memory:

"Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom.

"Whenever a matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately."

My privilege is that the government has denied publicly to me the existence of a report that subsequently was found to exist. The Premier, on February 5, when we were discussing Ipperwash, said: "You make up imaginary files. You make up imaginary involvement. There were no files, there were no records...." He goes on to say, "You have a wild imagination with no facts...."

Subsequently, and the reason I raise this today, it was found the government did indeed have the files the Premier is denying existed. The reason I raise it with you, Mr Speaker, is that the Premier denied these files existed, denied privilege to the members, denied information to the members that we require in order to assess the government. Clearly my privileges then have been abused by the Premier. I would have raised it with the Premier in the House, and I understood he would be here today. I gather his plans have changed. I rely now on you, Mr Speaker.

1530

In my opinion, my privileges have been abused. We asked for information. The government denied that information existed. We now find, through a freedom of information request, that the information that the Premier said did not exist does exist. It is an important memo dated September 5. It indicates how the government planned to deal with the first nations at Ipperwash and indicates how the OPP were going to deal with the first nations at Ipperwash.

My point is this, Mr Speaker: If you can't guarantee to the members of the House that the government will be forthcoming with information, if you can't guarantee that the government will not try and say information does not exist when it does exist, who can we rely on?

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Is this related? Okay. The member for Algoma.

Mr Wildman: On the point that was raised by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, I think it's important for us to recognize that repeatedly in this House members requested the information and repeatedly the Premier alleged that the documentation did not exist. On May 29 the Premier stated not only that he would give all the documentation that was available and that the documentation we were asking for didn't exist; he also stated that there was no direction given by this government.

Now we have the documentation, the notes of the meeting on September 5, and in those notes it is clear — under the heading “next steps” it states that the OPP will remove the occupiers from the Ipperwash Provincial Park ASAP. Not only does it state that, it states that the OPP will have discretion on how to remove them — not whether or not to remove them, but how to remove them.

It is clear, it appears from the documentation that is now available through a freedom of information request, that indeed the documentation certainly existed and in that documentation there was direction given by this government to the OPP to remove demonstrators from the park as soon as possible; not a question of whether they should be removed, but to do it as soon as possible and to use whatever force, it appears, necessary.

The Speaker: To the members for Algoma and Scarborough-Agincourt, I have not got any ability to test the veracity of any statement made in this place. I appreciate your points of order. With that knowledge, it's impossible for me to in fact investigate or test the veracity. I can only ask that you, as a member for Scarborough-Agincourt or a member for Algoma, bring this up during question period. I understand your frustration at that point, but again it's not within my power to compel members to be here at any prescribed hour or time. I appreciate your concerns and I appreciate your problems, but I have limited scope in dealing with the concerns you bring to this House.

The member for Cochrane South.

M. Gilles Bisson (Cochrane-Sud) : Comme vous le savez, il y a eu des décisions très récemment faisant affaire avec l'hôpital Montfort, le seul hôpital francophone en Ontario, qui va fermer ses portes si le gouvernement a sa manière faisant affaire avec cette institution. Je demanderais au Président de la Chambre de demander le consentement unanime pour qu'on ait un débat spécial aujourd'hui selon les questions de l'hôpital Montfort.

The Speaker: I've dealt with the unanimous consent issues already. Now is points of order, and I wanted to move on from those particular ones.

Interjection.

The Speaker: I appreciate the member for Cochrane South's indulgence.

I've got three more. Member for Essex-Kent.

Mr Pat Hoy (Essex-Kent): Thank you, Speaker. I have a point of order. Yesterday in this House the member for Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings, in a member's statement, sought to declare this week, April 1 to 4, Agriculture and Food Week. He exceeded his 90 seconds and you rightfully cut him off. I would seek unanimous consent to pay tribute to the vital role of agriculture and food during this week and the —

The Speaker: As I said to the member for Cochrane South, it was no. The member for Timiskaming. I only have two more here.

Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming): Thank you, Mr Speaker. You have been in your place now for over two hours, and many of us in the opposition are very concerned that the opposition tactics this afternoon have taken their toll on the Speaker. I would suggest the Speaker might require a visit to the library or another facility to have a little break until you're well rested to carry on.

The Speaker: I really appreciate that. Thanks so much for your concern. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr Michael Gravelle (Port Arthur): Mr Speaker, a point of privilege: On January 10 I sent a letter to the Minister of Education and Training in relation to a matter that was of great significance for those of us in northern Ontario. It had to do with the fact that the Independent Learning Centre, which —

The Speaker: What is your point of privilege?

Mr Gravelle: The point is that this indeed is something where northern Ontario teachers basically receive employment through the Independent Learning Centre. The minister made a decision to cut it out so they couldn't do that. I sent a letter to the minister on January 10, and on February 10 I received a letter back from the head of the Independent Learning Centre, Mr Russ Garrett, rather than the minister himself. My point of privilege is that indeed, in that I had written a letter to the minister on a matter that I wanted a response from him directly, it seems to me that it's one of my privileges as a member that the minister should reply —

The Speaker: That's not a point of privilege. I appreciate that you may have some great concerns, but that's not a point of privilege, who the minister writes or doesn't write back to. Maybe it should be; get together and you'll decide one day it is, but right now it's not.

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): I have two points of order. Do you wish me to deal with them concurrently?

The Speaker: I guess.

Mr Sergio: Thank you. I believe that last night you had met with a group of concerned citizens, which was very nice of you.

The Speaker: I'd like to hear your point of order.

Mr Sergio: It's coming.

The Speaker: Let me be clear on this point of order, member for Yorkview. Let's hear the points of order.

Mr Sergio: My points, both of them, are this: A few minutes ago I was on my way to your office where we have some statements with respect to our pension plan and I was met in the hallway by three young ladies from the city of North York. They are school trustees. One of them I recognized as Ms Elsa Chandler.

The Speaker: I'd really like to hear your point of order, member. I want to hear your point of order. I can't be any more direct than that. What is your point of order?

Mr Sergio: My point of order is that they were refused entry to the upper balconies. The reason —

The Speaker: Member for Yorkview, there are a significant number of people here today. We're not refusing people entry on whether there's a like or a dislike. I'd ask the member for Yorkview to take his seat. There are a number of people in many committee rooms around this building today who would like to get in. We've instituted a system that allows access as quickly as we can. We did not disallow people to come in based on any other factor than first come, first served.

It's time for oral questions.

Interjection.

The Speaker: No, I dealt with yours, member for St Catharines.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Yorkview, I appreciate they're slowly filling. I'm doing my best.

Member for St Catharines, I've dealt with them all. I dealt with seven. I want to get to question period. If your point of privilege is that important, in question period you can pop up at that time and we'll take it.

It's time for oral questions.

Mr Bradley: I just want to clarify something. You said immediately at the conclusion of question period you will hear it?

The Speaker: No, I said if it's important, during question period is as good a time as any to hear points of privilege, if you want to bring it up then. I'd really like to get to question period. I specifically itemized the seven I would hear. You were not part of that seven. If you were, you were in the very beginning.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I'll give him my spot.

The Speaker: I appreciate that, but there's no transference of points of order. It's time for oral questions. I'm looking for —

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member for Algoma, I have heard a number of points of privilege. I have never suggested to the member for Lake Nipigon —

Mr Robert Chiarelli (Ottawa West): But these are points of order.

The Speaker: I can veto points of order.

Mr Chiarelli: No, you can't.

The Speaker: Member from Ottawa, I just read very recently in the ruling why I can. I would like to move to oral questions.

Mr Wildman: On a point of personal privilege.

The Speaker: No. Time for oral questions.

Interjection.

The Speaker: There's only a point of privilege and a point of order. I will hear the member for Algoma's point of privilege.

Mr Wildman: You have stated that the staff is trying to process the people to come in as quickly as possible. You've also stated that the metal detector is broken. I have checked and the metal detector is not broken.

The Speaker: I just got a correction. They came in and they said it wasn't broken. I'm sorry; I got misinformation. I apologize.

Mr Wildman: They why aren't you processing them?
1540

The Speaker: I don't know, to the member for Algoma; I just don't know.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): Why don't you recess and find out?

The Speaker: I'm not going to recess and find out, to the member for Kingston and The Islands.

Time for oral questions. I am looking for a question. I'll go to the third party.

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Member for Lawrence, is it an oral question?

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): Before we do that —

The Speaker: No, it's not "before we do that," member for Lawrence. I want an oral question. I will go to the third party.

Interjections.

The Speaker: No. Time for oral questions. Is there no one getting up? I will look to the third party, then. It's time for oral questions. Member for Lawrence.

VISITOR

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): Before we do that, I'd like to recognize in attendance today in the members' gallery a former MPP for Halton-Burlington, Don Knight.

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: There was a very unusual thing that happened yesterday in regard to this assembly. The Premier of this province made some very significant statements in the press today and we will not be able to question him; these relate to significant amendments in Bill 103. I would hope that sometime today we get a chance to question the Premier on his positions that he's changed.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): What's your point of privilege?

Mr Colle: As a member of this Legislature, I think when a significant statement is made by the Premier, he should make it in the Legislature so we can question him and respond, not just in the press.

The Speaker: Let's move to questions.

POINTS OF PRIVILEGE

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I'm looking at standing order 21(b), which states very clearly, "Whenever a matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately." I wonder, sir, if you might explain your ruling to deal with points of privilege at times other than when immediately raised. I think that breaches our privileges.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: Would you explain to the official opposition that the clock is now ticking on question period.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): You see, the clock is now ticking on question period.

The second thing is that Erskine May allows the Speaker, as backup information to this, if the Speaker considers points of order to become obtrusive and obstructive, that he may in fact not see points of order and move on. I'm not sure if the member was here at that time, but I read very directly into the record about when that is allowed and how the Speaker can determine those things, and I did that at that time. A point of privilege is in fact seen as the same kind of thing as a point of order.

Member for Lawrence.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Premier this morning himself finally admitted what everyone's saying about your megacity bill. He admitted that your megacity bill is flawed. It is flawed because it will lead to higher

property taxes. It's flawed because it will weaken our communities. Most importantly, it is flawed because it goes directly against the will of the people, the will of the majority, I might remind you, Minister, 75% of whom voted no in the referenda.

Now that your Premier has admitted that your legislation is flawed, why won't you scrap Bill 103 and start all over again?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): To the member from the official opposition, obviously there's very little in this world that is perfect and I would be the first to admit that this bill may not be perfect. It's not perfect, but it's darned good.

I know the member made reference that the Premier said the bill was flawed because it would raise taxes. I would indicate that's not what the Premier said at all. That statement is entirely inaccurate. What this bill does is address the concerns of Metropolitan Toronto. It provides a unified single city while ensuring that neighbourhoods throughout the city are protected.

Outbreak of coughing.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): There's something in the air, Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I appreciate that. To the public gallery, I consider that a demonstration. I want to be very clear. That's a demonstration. It won't happen again. If it does, then I have to remove the people I see participating in that demonstration. To the members on the floor, I would ask that you not do that. Thank you. Minister?

Hon Mr Leach: Just to repeat, when the Premier said the bill is less than perfect, obviously nothing is absolutely perfect, but this bill is going to go a long way to ensuring that the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto have a great city to live in and a good government to represent them. With 56 members and one elected mayor, it will go a long to ensuring that there is representation that everyone will be able to relate to and be proud of.

Mr Cordiano: The minister seems to forget that 75% voted against you in the referenda. They said no to your megacity. They told you to scrap Bill 103. You aren't listening, Minister. You're ignoring everything everybody said to you.

The will of the people, the will of the majority of the residents of Metropolitan Toronto — you are ignoring them. I'd like to understand. Tell us today, what part of the word "no" don't you understand? Why won't you accept that no means no?

Hon Mr Leach: We obviously listened to everybody who voiced their opinion and view on going to the unified city. We listened to the 600 delegates who came in to the hearing process. We listened to all the comments that were made in the various town hall meetings that were held. We know that their concerns related to neighbourhoods and communities and protecting municipalities. We heard that and we've amended the bill.

They also said they were concerned about representation, so we increased the number of representatives to be elected from 44 to 56, plus an elected mayor. We made sure we had neighbourhood committees. We made sure there will be community councils so that the residents of the various wards in the areas and the municipalities that

exist today will have someone they can go to and deal with directly.

We heard all of that. We made the appropriate amendments and I believe those amendments satisfy the concerns of the people.

Mr Cordiano: Minister, you've chosen to ignore the warnings from the Metro board of trade, you've chosen to ignore the warnings of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation and you've chosen to ignore the people of Metro Toronto. They've all said no to your megacity and your mega-dumping.

There's only one word to describe you, your government and your Premier: arrogant. You've become so arrogant that you're prepared to do whatever it takes to get your way.

Minister, will you finally accept what everyone's been telling you? Will you finally accept that your idea of a megacity is flawed and no one wants it? Will you finally accept that you are wrong in your approach to this megacity and withdraw your legislation today? That's what we're asking you to do. You should do so today and let's get on with it.

Hon Mr Leach: If the member was going to make insulting remarks, he could at least get his facts right. The board of trade supports amalgamation. They've said that repeatedly. They came out on a number of occasions and indicated that the board of trade, their 10,000 members, all support going to one unified, single city because they recognize the advantages of going to a single city to get rid of the waste and duplication we have now, having multiple layers of government that just add confusion to the citizens of this metropolis.

Now we have an opportunity to go to one single city and provide the efficiencies that are created by that while continuing to provide local input through community councils for all the citizens of this great city.

IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question, in the absence of the Premier, is to the Solicitor General. It has to do with Ipperwash and the circumstances surrounding the tragic death there of the first nations person.

In the past, the minister will know the Premier has said, "We had no involvement in this." We now find, through information that has been made public very recently, that in fact the government did make the key decision. The key decision there was, and I'm quoting from the document — here's what the province decided: "The province will take steps to remove the occupiers as soon as possible." It then went on to say the OPP does not have the discretion to determine how they're going to handle this. The OPP has to carry out that order. The OPP will simply have the discretion as to "how to proceed with removing the Stoney Pointers from the park."

1550

My question to you, Minister, is this: Who made the decision to remove the first nations as soon as possible from the park?

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services): I'll refer that question to the Attorney General.

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Let's be very clear. There are two separate issues here. The government had a choice to take action to end the illegal occupation through a civil injunction. The September 5 minutes make it obvious that this was the recommendation. We wanted to see the occupation end peacefully and we were prepared to take appropriate steps through the civil injunction to deal with it on that basis.

The OPP had the discretion as to how to proceed with removing the occupiers. This is completely separate from anything the government did. Quite simply, no instructions were given to the OPP, there was no political interference, and this has been confirmed by the OPP commissioner.

Mr Phillips: The government made this decision: "We are going to get the first nations out of that park as soon as possible." Sitting in that meeting was a senior OPP officer. The Premier called him the liaison officer for this affair. He reports back to the field officers in the OPP. It is clear the government made this decision: "Get them out of the park as soon as possible." Then the OPP had only once choice.

I might add the the OPP had, in advance of this, prepared a plan called Project Maple. The objective: to contain and negotiate a peaceful solution. That's what the OPP wanted to do. They didn't want to force this thing. They didn't want to get them out as soon as possible. They wanted to contain and negotiate a peaceful solution.

The question is this: Why did the government reject the OPP's plan to negotiate and contain —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you.

Hon Mr Harnick: As I said, the government had no input whatsoever into the actions of the Ontario Provincial Police.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): That is poppycock. Can't you even read your own document?

The Speaker: Member for Algoma, I would ask you to come to order.

Hon Mr Harnick: The fact is that the Ontario Provincial Police dealt with this on their own. They had no input from the government. The commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police confirmed that this was in fact the situation. He indicated that the decisions that were made were decisions made by the OPP. Quite simply, the government's position was to deal with this on the basis of obtaining a civil injunction.

Mr Phillips: The Premier told us in the House that there were no files. We now find we have the files. There were files. It was clear the government made a fundamental decision: "Get them out of the park as soon as possible."

You did not give the OPP any options. The OPP had one option, according to your document: The OPP had the discretion only as to "how to proceed with removing the Stoney Pointers from the park." It's clear you told the police, "Get them out." The only option they've got is how they do it, not whether they negotiate peacefully.

I would say to you, how could the OPP take any interpretation other than the one that is in your document; that is, that the government wants them out of the park as soon as possible and the government has instructed the

OPP, "Remove them as soon as possible"? How can we take any other interpretation than that from your own finally public documents?

Hon Mr Harnick: The government gave no instructions to the OPP. The government took the steps immediately to obtain a civil injunction.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Harnick: Again, I confirm what OPP Commissioner O'Grady has already said. He made it very clear that there were no instructions given to the Ontario Provincial Police by the government. The only step the government took was to immediately begin the preparation of the materials and attend in court to obtain a civil injunction.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): I wanted to ask this question of the Premier about his comments, but once again he is not here, so I will ask the minister responsible for municipal affairs.

Today in the Toronto Star, the Premier called your megacity legislation "less than perfect." He also said he hoped the bill could be made better by the year 2000. Then he said he thinks you've got the number of councillors all wrong. Minister, if your own Premier thinks your bill still needs work, can you tell us why you're going to try to pass it today?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): As the Premier said this morning, obviously nothing is perfect, but the bill is very, very good. The bill addresses all the concerns of the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto. Could it be improved? Certainly it can be improved. That's why we've introduced a number of amendments to further improve the bill. When the new council is elected, will they be able to take actions that could improve the bill? I'm quite confident they will.

That's why in the legislation and in the amendments we've given great powers to the municipality and the newly elected council to address concerns they may see in the manner in which the bill directs that the city operate. We recognize that and that was the Premier's whole point, that we see the new council for the city of Toronto having the ability to deal with amendments or changes that should be made, I think a very fair and reasonable thing to do.

Mr Hampton: You don't get it, do you? Even the Premier says your bill is flawed and you still don't get it. Seventy-six per cent of the people in this city vote against you in a referendum and you don't get it. More people voted against your bill than voted for the Conservative Party in the last election and you still don't get it, do you?

Look, there are more and more people — the opposition is continuing to grow. I'm going to send over these cards for you to show you the opposition is continuing to grow. I'm going to say to you very clearly that we are going to go to the wall to stop this bill. You are not going to get this bill easily.

Minister, maybe you can tell us. When the Premier says your bill is not perfect, when the public says they're opposed to it, where you do get off only allowing one

hour today to debate these amendments? Where do you get off in showing this contempt for people?

Hon Mr Leach: To the member of the third party, I assume your party agreed to the time allocation motion. That's something where agreement is reached by the House leaders, I assume. It's certainly something I didn't play a personal part in.

But, as the member mentioned, do I think the bill could be improved? Certainly I think the bill could be improved and that's why we've introduced all the amendments to do so. Any piece of legislation that has gone through this House could be improved. I'm sure when the new council is elected, they will continue to deal with the issues that face any new government in any transition period and make adjustments that will continue to improve it.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 34(a), I wish to advise you of my dissatisfaction with the response of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and wish to debate the matter further. I apologize for interrupting question period, but it's 4 o'clock and 4 o'clock is the deadline.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Four o'clock is the deadline for a written submission.

Member for Dovercourt, is this a new question?

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): No, it's the final supplementary.

The Speaker: Oh, final supplementary, member for Dovercourt.

Hon Mr Leach: Mr Speaker, I'd like to correct the record, if I might. I was mistaken when I said that the parties agreed to the time allocation motion. It was a government-sponsored motion.

1600

Mr Silipo: Speaker, I'm glad the minister has corrected the record on that, because he should know, of all people, very clearly that we have been so clear from the outset in our opposition to Bill 103 and Bill 104. We will continue in every way we can within the rules of this place to show our opposition, because that opposition reflects the mounting opposition from across Metropolitan Toronto on Bill 103.

People are going to continue that fight, Minister. You should have no hesitation in understanding that. We know at least two serious court challenges will go ahead if you pass this bill. I want to say to you today, as my leader said yesterday in this House, that if we form the next government, we will revoke Bill 103. The people of Toronto didn't vote for your mini-councils, they didn't vote for your 57 politicians, they didn't vote for your megacity; they said no. They said no, and it's up to you now to show that you've listened to some extent at least. Will you withdraw the bill?

Hon Mr Leach: Again, I will repeat that we did listen. We listened to the deputants who came in to the committee hearings, all 600 of them. We listened to everybody who spoke at the town hall meetings. We took into consideration the votes that were held in the various municipalities. That's why we made the substantive changes and the number of amendments we made to this bill. People were telling us that they wanted to protect

local identity. The amendments we're making do protect local identity, while giving us the advantage of moving to a single city.

I think we have addressed the concerns of the vast majority of the people of Metropolitan Toronto. Are you going to satisfy everyone? I doubt that, because very few actions are taken by anyone in this world that satisfy everyone. But we have taken actions to satisfy the vast majority of people of Metropolitan Toronto who support going to a single city to get rid of the waste and duplication and the various levels of government that now cause a lot of confusion to everyone.

SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): To the Minister of Education, I, along with other MPPs, participated in the committee hearings on Bill 104. In particular, in Thunder Bay we heard, as well as in other communities, that the boundaries you have proposed for many of the new school districts are unrealistic and undemocratic.

In northwestern Ontario, for example, we heard from people in Red Lake who will have to drive, one way, more than three hours to attend the closest board meeting. We also heard in the north that your proposed boundaries ignore the realities of school board affiliations with first nations. Yet your amendments to Bill 104 do nothing to address these concerns, nothing to address the concerns that were raised there and in other places. Are you prepared to change the district school board boundaries you introduced in January, and if so, how are you going to change those unrealistic and undemocratic boundaries?

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Education and Training): May I say that I am surprised that the leader of the third party, who obviously has been watching with some care Bill 104 and its movement through second reading and some of the public conversations and debates that have been had about Bill 104, would at this stage in the process, as this bill is ready to come with amendments to the committee of the whole and further on into third reading, I am shocked, as a matter of fact, that the leader of the third party would be so ill informed about the contents of the bill or about how school board sizes and district sizes will be regulated in the future.

We have said on many occasions that we'll be getting recommendations in, post the passage of this bill if it passes in what we believe to be its final form; we would be getting recommendations back on the fine-tuning of the size of district boards from the EIC, and we anticipate doing some of that. We're very happy to address that. We've made that very clear publicly in the past. Again, I'm shocked that the leader of the third party would not have had this information before now.

Mr Hampton: The minister says he's surprised. Let me tell you how surprised the people across Ontario are. People faithfully went to committee hearings and faithfully put forward their positions hoping this government would listen, but what is clear from the government amendments that have been presented is that you listened to absolutely no one. It is John Snobelen who thinks he knows all, John Snobelen who thinks he doesn't have to listen to anyone.

You're going to have people driving three hours one way over winter highways that your colleague can't maintain now and three hours back the other way under some of the most unsafe conditions. People are pleading with you that you recognize there is no way boards can function, and the best you can say is, "Oh, we might fine-tune this."

Minister, show that you have listened to people. Show that you have listened to people by introducing amendments here today that deal with these very critical problems. Will you do that, show that you've at least listened to some people?

Hon Mr Snobelen: I know the leader of the third party has a research staff and has people who can advise him. Perhaps he should go back and talk to some of his researchers and talk to some of the people who are familiar with the process of putting this bill through the Legislature. Perhaps he can become aware of what can be done in regulations to this bill and some of the public statements by this minister and other members of this government —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): The Minister of Education.

Hon Mr Snobelen: Again I would advise the leader of the third party to perhaps get some advice on this because we do intend to address the issues that have come forward. We do intend to make sure the people in the north are adequately represented. We want to make sure we have a system of education that provides a quality education to all of the young people in the north. By the way, many of the people in the north are excited about the possibilities that will come from a fairer funding system that the previous government refused to address, so we are addressing that as well.

We will address those concerns. We will address them in the regulations and we'll get some further advice on just how to do that.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): The minister says he's surprised. We are surprised that he obviously hasn't been talking to his own parliamentary assistants, the members for Wentworth North and Halton Centre. If he had, he would know that on the standing committee on social development, twice the committee voted unanimously to have the boundaries reconsidered — unanimously.

The minister will know that we probably are going to be voting at some point today on Bill 103 in committee. He will know that his government has proposed changes in that bill that would change the number of Metro wards to 28 from 22. Bill 104 bases the maximum number of trustees in Metro on the old proposal of 22 wards. Have you consulted with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing about this and are you prepared to move amendments to Bill 104 —

The Speaker: Thank you very much. Minister of Education.

Hon Mr Snobelen: Now I'm disappointed that the member for Algoma appears to be no better informed than the leader of the third party. First of all, the committee did vote. They voted for the EIC to give us some recommendations on boundaries, and if the members of

the third party would allow us to get Bill 104 through the House, we'll have an EIC and they can give us some advice on boundaries. If you're concerned about the northern areas, please help us get this bill through the House so we can have some advice from the EIC on how to make sure those people are fairly represented.

As far as the situation with the 22 trustees in the Metropolitan area, again I'm surprised that the member for Algoma would not know that currently the ward boundaries have nothing to do with the distribution of trustees; that has to do with the student population from the different school areas, and I have certainly consulted with my colleagues on that subject and we certainly do have a plan —

Interjection.

The Speaker: The member for Lake Nipigon.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): I will withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: New question.

1610

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): My question is also to the Minister of Education. I would suggest to the Minister of Education that as a northerner and as somebody who was at all the hearings across northern Ontario, I didn't find a single northerner who was excited about the kinds of changes that he's planning to bring to education in this province, let alone in northern Ontario. I would suggest that if this minister had paid one bit of attention to the hearings that we had across this province, he would be better informed coming into this House today and responding to the concerns that we heard.

We heard from about 400 groups and individuals concerned about the proposals that this minister is planning to ram through this House this week. We would have heard from about 1,000 more who didn't get a chance to make their views known to the committee. We heard today from students who conducted a referendum and 80% of them were expressing their opposition to this minister's plans.

The vast majority of people who did get a chance to make their views known to the committee had one question over and above all the others, because they didn't understand this government's rush. They didn't understand why the bill had to be rammed through before anybody, including anybody in the government, knows how it's going to work. They couldn't believe a responsible government would make a law and then leave it up to a commission to figure out how to make it work.

I ask the minister, tell those people —

The Speaker: Thank you, member for Fort William. Minister of Education.

Hon Mr Snobelen: To the member for Fort William, obviously we heard from a lot of people during the hearings. We heard from a lot of people who were looking forward to an improved education system to assist them with higher standards of achievement for students, to assist them where our attentions, our energies and our resources were focused on the classroom and on making a difference with students. I've heard that time and again from people right across this province.

I believe, at the end of the day, there are a number of people who are eager to see Bill 104 passed and to get on

with the business of creating a new school system in Ontario. I would encourage the member to talk to her colleagues and encourage them to get passage of this bill this week so that the people who have to work on that new school system can get to work and make it happen.

As far as being too quick, after four or five years of delays, after 24 studies in my lifetime, after all of that time in committees and discussion, it is time now to get a system of education that can take our students to the next millennium. This government is in a hurry to do that.

Mrs McLeod: Those words uttered by this minister have no meaning whatsoever. The people who presented to the committee and expressed their concerns knew that they had no meaning whatsoever, and that's why they're worried.

Minister, I say to you, we heard from those people. You did not, and clearly you're not prepared to hear what they had to say. I asked you a question: What's your rush? Your parliamentary assistant was at least prepared to volunteer an answer on your behalf. He said the reason you were in a rush to pass this bill through was that it would save some money and you were in a hurry to get making those savings as fast as possible. He didn't talk about students.

Minister, your own study shows that the savings from school board amalgamation would be less than 1% of your budget, and that's not enough to give the finance minister what he needs in order to fund his tax cut. You've made it clear in the past that you're ready to help the finance minister and the Premier out, you're ready to contribute at least \$1 billion to fund the tax cut, and the Premier says he needs your \$1 billion.

If this whole so-called, to use your words, "education reform" isn't simply a way to get control of education so you can find your \$1 billion-plus, if your money is really going into the classroom as your backbenchers have been told and they believe, will you guarantee today that the total funding for education —

The Speaker: Minister of Education.

Hon Mr Snobelen: I have assured the member opposite on several occasions that we will have a fair allocation system for our students in Ontario, that we will end the funding system that you left in place, that your government left in place, which funds some students as much as twice as much as other students, not predicated on their need but predicated on the property value of houses in their area. We think that's an unfair way to fund education. Everyone who has studied it has said that's an unfair way to fund education, and we've promised to end that. We've promised as a government to take on the obligation of having a fair funding system and making sure — we're on record several times — there's a sufficient amount of money to provide a first-class education for every student in this province, and we will do that.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS REVIEW

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): My question is for the Minister of Health. Last month I asked you about your plans to revise the Health Protection and Promotion

Act, the legislative authority which stipulates what programs and services must be provided by public health units.

You refused to answer, and that gave everybody fears that what your government is doing is abandoning the prevention of disease and health promotion measures designed to ensure a healthier population, as you download public health units on to the municipalities. Those fears have been confirmed because we've received a copy of your revised guidelines to public health units. You know municipalities are not going to be able to afford the full range of preventive programs they now offer, so you've chosen priorities for them.

Minister, will you explain to us today why this document has no specific programs aimed at the prevention of substance abuse outside of the context of drinking and driving? Can you tell us why you have taken that away as a mandatory program to be offered by public health units?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): The honourable member obviously wasn't pleased with the answer I gave her, which was the truth, the last time, and that is: This whole mandatory program, or basket of programs that are to be delivered by public health units, was last looked at by the Liberal government in 1989, I believe — I held the document up — and I don't have anything to do with this process. Dr Richard Schabas, the chief medical officer of health, has been meeting with public health officials and they're reviewing and setting priorities for public health across the province. I've had no report from those working groups come to my office for my review at this time and it is totally driven by the people and the health care providers in public health.

Second, the honourable member should know that municipalities run 100% of our public health units now, today, so we're not downloading anything to the municipalities. Every employee of public health today is an employee of a municipality in this province.

Mrs Boyd: Minister, that's absolutely ridiculous. You know very well that your proposed download cuts the cost-sharing of many programs that affect health promotion and disease prevention in this province. That's nonsense. Are you trying to tell us that the public officer of health does not report to you?

We've talked to public health officials from across the province and we know that your government is directing them to pare down their programs and their services. We know they've been told, at their consultation meeting last week for example, that they should identify only core programs, and we know what that means from your business plans.

According to your draft guidelines for public health units, they're to get out of the business of targeted programs for special populations that have special health needs. The only mention, for example, of seniors in this document relates to the prevention of falls, nothing else. No longer are there programs targeted at adolescents or newborns. The focus on specific diseases, rather than the health of the general population, is there.

Minister, will you confirm that the new guidelines are really aimed at reassuring —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Wilson: While the honourable member was a member of the NDP government, they did nothing for public health over five years except tobacco legislation. This government has got the public health nurses, in cooperation with the local municipalities, out into the classrooms, doing the first comprehensive hepatitis-B immunization program for the children. We're looking at hepatitis-C; we're looking at all the immunization programs; they're delivering programs to seniors for the pneumococcal flu vaccine: all programs that you failed to fund during your five years in office. We can say today with confidence that in the province of Ontario we have public health units and vaccination and immunization programs second to none in North America, provided by public taxpayers at no cost to the people and the children and seniors who need those programs.

I am proud of our record in public health, and I fail to see what is wrong with public health officials having meetings, reviewing their mandatory programs and setting their own standards, so that their standards and priorities meet the priorities and standards of the people of Ontario. That's the exercise that's going on now, and there's a lot of work to be done.

1620

HOME CARE

Mr Toby Barrett (Norfolk): My question is to the minister responsible for seniors. In my riding of Norfolk, seniors have asked me about health care and how their health care dollars are being reinvested. Over the past few weeks, you and Health Minister Wilson have toured the province, making re-investment announcements concerning hospitals, cardiac care, cancer treatment, mental health programs and long-term care. What impact will these kinds of investments have for people in Ontario?

Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister without Portfolio [Seniors Issues]): It's clear this government recognizes the importance of building a health care system that recognizes the health needs of a growing and aging population in this province. As members know, this government is currently spending \$1.1 billion a year — that's \$3 million a day — on home care services in this province.

Last week and the week before, my colleague the Minister of Health and I visited several communities which identified that they were underserved from years of lack of funding and support from the previous government with respect to investing new additional dollars that we're adding to our \$17.7-billion health care budget.

We were in Hamilton and provided several million additional dollars, 25 million additional home care dollars in Toronto and another \$7 million in the Niagara Peninsula. In fact, at York Central Hospital in Richmond Hill we provided \$4.5 million in capital to enable us to build a facility for a 100-bed nursing home. Those 100 beds were approved a decade ago. They were never built under successive Liberal and NDP —

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you very much.

Mr Barrett: In my riding, I held open forum meetings and information sessions in eight community nursing

homes and retirement homes. Some seniors who attended voiced concerns for the ability of the care system to accommodate them. As the hospital system is redesigned and as our population ages, as you mentioned, we all recognize the need for more community based services. But we hear stories about support agencies that are already stretched to the limit. Will the reinvestments put an end to waiting lists for home care services?

Hon Mr Jackson: As the member indicated in his question, there are problem areas in this province. There are areas where there are no waiting lists at all for these kinds of supports, and there are other areas where there are waiting lists. This government is moving decisively with a plan in order to resolve these historical inequities that have been left by previous governments that failed to equitably manage this. That's why we have different levels of care in this province depending on whether you're a disabled person in Windsor or whether you're in Kingston. We've moved to correct that.

We've also moved decisively to downsize the amount of money wasted in administration by having one window with community care access centres instead of two payroll systems, two administrators, two assessment levels. This is a more efficient system. I'm pleased to report that the savings generated by this government of Ontario initiative in Peel alone represented half a million dollars of administrative savings, which is being put right back into client services in this province. In Peel alone, that will buy 26,576 more hours of homemaking services —

The Speaker: Thank you. New question.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Minister, we've come down to the final hours here. You went to the hearings where people told you they didn't want the megacity. Your caucus went to the hearings right across Metro. They all said it was a joke, they didn't want your megacity. At the hearings, hundreds of people all said, "No megacity." The referenda all said, "No megacity"; 80% said no.

The basic question is: What gives you the right to say no to the referenda, to the hearings, to all the people at the public meetings? What God-given right do you have to ignore these people and all this democratic expression? Where do you get the right to do that?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): To the member for Oakwood, that's strange coming from somebody who supported amalgamation all the time he was in municipal office. I find that very strange. However, to respond to his question, we did listen. We listened to all the deputants who came to this building and made their positions clear about the role of the trustees, about the role of the transition team, about the number of elected representatives who should be there. We listened very intently to people at town hall meetings as well. That's why we've made the number of amendments to this bill that we have. We've introduced changes to the number of representatives. We've introduced changes to the transition team. We've introduced

changes to the trustees. I think that clearly indicates that we listened very carefully and made appropriate changes to ensure that we do have a single unified city that serves the people of Metropolitan Toronto well.

Mr Colle: This is the same minister who before the election went door to door in his riding saying he was going to eliminate Metro and make local government stronger and it's the same Premier who said the same thing in Elora, so don't tell us about inconsistency. You're the person who's saying: "I don't care what people say. Only Al Leach knows what's right. I know what's good for Toronto."

Again I ask you, Minister, what gives you the right to ignore and belittle and patronize the citizens of Metro Toronto and force the amalgamation on them whether they like it or not? What gives you the right to do that?

Hon Mr Leach: To repeat, we did listen to what the citizens of this area said. I guess ultimately what gave us the right —

Mr Colle: They said no.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): They said no to a unified city.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Members for Oakwood and Kingston and The Islands, as we have this conversation, the time will tick off.

Hon Mr Leach: To repeat, it's obvious that we did listen to the people who appeared before us. All the written submissions that were made were read and all the committee hearings I couldn't attend personally I watched on tape, so I am well aware of the concerns expressed by the citizens who had concerns and also of all the people who showed up to support our position at the public meetings, and there were many of those as well.

Did we listen? Certainly we listened. We listened to the concerns about having a single city, we listened to the concerns about the trustees, we listened to the concerns about the transition team, and we've made amendments to correct those.

INVESTIGATION INTO POLICE SHOOTING

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): A question to the Solicitor General. Last weekend there was yet another fatal shooting by police. The list is growing longer: Edmond Yu, Faraz Suleman, and now Hugh Dawson, among the most recent. An eyewitness and layperson at the scene said, "I thought it was a gang fight.... They hit the guy and they're leaving." It has also been reported that one of the police officers who discharged his firearm had his wife accompany him to this scenario.

There are many questions that need answering. We're told that the witness officers and the subject officers still have not cooperated with the SIU. What are you, as Solicitor General, doing to ensure that all police officers involved in fatal shootings cooperate promptly and fully with the SIU, as is required under subsection 113(9) of the Police Services Act?

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services): The member cited the section of the act where there is a requirement for police officers to cooperate with the investigations of the SIU. The director of the SIU has recourse available to

him if indeed he is not receiving the statutorily required cooperation from any individual police officer or group of police officers. I would suggest that the tools are there. If the director feels it's necessary to take action in that respect, he has the ability to do so.

Mr Kormos: Minister, you're the Solicitor General. You're in charge, and public confidence is eroding, is caving in, because in the meantime, it has been reported, the witness officers and subject officers have met twice as a group. One can only wonder at the purpose of these meetings and at the appropriateness of them. Indeed, Mr Marin, the director of the SIU, has already stated that such meetings would affect how the evidence is regarded.

In order to ensure that justice prevails, all the subject officers and all the witness officers must promptly and fully cooperate with the SIU. Marin also said, "Your best evidence is your freshest evidence."

You're the Solicitor General. When are you going to enforce and direct the enforcement of subsection 113(9) of the Police Services Act, which states, as you well know: "Members of police forces shall cooperate fully with the members of the unit," the SIU, "in the conduct of investigation"? The ball is in your park now, Minister.
1630

Hon Mr Runciman: The member opposite, as is frequently the case with opposition members who are trying to play both sides of the fence here — if I was seen to be interfering in any kind of police investigation, he'd be on his feet immediately asking for my resignation.

One of the reasons the SIU was moved a number of years ago under the aegis of the Attorney General was to get away from —

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Order.

Hon Mr Runciman: As I was saying, a number of years ago the responsibility for the special investigations unit was transferred to the Ministry of the Attorney General simply to address the public concerns about any possible conflict of interest or interference in police investigations or investigations of police officers.

Mr Marin, as I indicated, has a number of options available to him as the director, and if he feels those options are inadequate he has the opportunity also to approach me, but I think it's quite appropriate for the Solicitor General, whoever occupies this office, not to be involved in those kinds of investigations.

SLOW-MOVING VEHICLES

Mr Bert Johnson (Perth): I rise in the House today to question the Minister of Transportation on a matter of grave importance.

Recently, my riding of Perth was devastated by a tragic accident resulting in three fatalities. The tragedy has drawn together a community. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my condolences to the Herteis and Kuefer families for the losses which they suffered.

While attempting to cross a regional road intersection at night, a horse-drawn buggy was struck by a car. There were no skid marks and it appears the occupants of the car never saw the buggy approaching the highway.

My riding of Perth is home to a large number of old order Mennonites. Could the minister please explain to the House what rules exist to protect both motorists and slow-moving vehicles on our provincial highways?

Hon Al Palladini (Minister of Transportation): I'd like to thank the member for Perth for the question. Like the honourable member, I was saddened to hear of this accident. I would like to reassure the House that safety on our highways is my number one priority.

The Highway Traffic Act requires that vehicles which cannot reach a speed of up to 40 kilometres an hour must display a bright orange "slow moving vehicle" sign. Some Amish and Mennonite families have not used these signs for religious reasons.

MTO has said it will grant an exemption on religious grounds as long as the "slow moving vehicle" sign is replaced by a reflective material outlining the rear of the vehicle. That's what we're working on.

Mr Bert Johnson: Following the accident, there was a meeting held in my riding to discuss the issues surrounding highway safety. The meeting was organized by the Mennonite Central Committee and was attended by over 70 representatives from such different groups as the Amish community, the Ministry of Transportation, buggy manufacturers, the OPP and Floradale volunteer fire department.

Could the minister please explain to this House and the viewing public the local solution these groups agreed upon, with your ministry's assistance, which could prevent such a tragedy from occurring in the future?

Hon Mr Palladini: I would like to tell the member for Perth that I was very pleased to see ministry staff working with these different groups to promote road safety. At the meeting, MTO staff clarified the rules which apply to slow-moving vehicles. We also put forward the suggestion that Amish and Mennonite families voluntarily put reflective material on the sides of their buggies and also on the shafts connecting it to the horse. I was very pleased to hear that the idea was accepted in a very receptive way.

In addition, various buggy manufacturers have said they will research the reflectivity and the colour of various materials on the market and will make recommendations to the Amish and Mennonite communities. I'm happy to report they have completed this research and will be making recommendations to the ministry and to the community very shortly.

SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS AUX HÔPITAUX FRENCH-LANGUAGE HOSPITAL SERVICES

M. Gilles E. Morin (Carleton-Est): Ma question s'adresse au ministre de la Santé. Lorsque le gouvernement précédent a décidé de rapatrier l'enseignement de la médecine en français qui s'effectuait au Québec, l'hôpital Montfort a été désigné hôpital d'enseignement affilié à l'Université d'Ottawa. Comment se fait-il qu'il ne soit pas fait mention dans le rapport de la commission que l'hôpital Montfort a été désigné hôpital d'enseignement affilié à l'Université d'Ottawa ? Comment expliquez-vous cette lacune ? Comment expliquez-vous cette omission ?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Health): I cannot speak for the commission, as it functions at arm's length, but I appreciate, and the member should know, that I think everybody in Ontario, and certainly every francophone in Ontario, knows that Montfort Hospital has a number of positions designated as teaching positions and residency positions for training in the first language, in many cases, of those physicians, in the French language.

Again, the commission was very careful with respect to that hospital and all hospitals and with respect to restructuring of the hospital system to say that no programs can be cut. The programs must be enhanced and maintained. In fact, more money is being spent on health care today, in spite of the \$2-billion cut from the federal government, than was spent when we came to office.

Restructuring is not about saving money or reducing services; it's about getting rid of things we don't need, like redundant bricks and mortar and administration, putting every penny and more back into front-line services because we've got an aging population, a growing population, and we have to prepare our health care system for that huge number of people about to come into the system requiring health care.

Mr Morin: Minister, you didn't answer my question at all, not at all. My question was so simple and so direct: How come you didn't give them instructions? It was your mandate, it was your obligation to tell them exactly what they should do.

Ma prochaine question : Si vous fermez Montfort, qui est essentiel pour la continuation du programme d'enseignement de la médecine en français en Ontario, est-ce que ça signifie qu'il faudra à nouveau s'exiler au Québec pour faire ses études en médecine en français ? Est-ce que c'est là la nouvelle direction que votre gouvernement veut prendre ?

Hon Mr Wilson: The building doesn't provide instructions in French. The people, the health care providers at Montfort Hospital provide residency training to young doctors who wish to practise in what is often their first language, the French language, and to serve francophones not only in Ottawa-Carleton but do us a tremendous service in serving francophones throughout Ontario. The programs will be preserved. The residency positions will be preserved.

Restructuring is about having more money for services, more money for residency programs. Maybe the honourable member should be saying to the government: "We only have eight designated positions now. Could we have 10 for French doctors in this province?" This government would answer yes, because we want to put more money into serving the francophones of this province in health care services and we want to put more money into serving the people — not the bricks and mortar, not the administration, but people who need services.

Mr Morin: Mr Speaker, I need your help. I've asked him the question in French, I've asked him the question in English, both languages, and he still doesn't understand what I'm getting at. What language should I use?

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): That's not a point of order.

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): — take no lessons from you guys. No way, no bloody way.

The Speaker: I'm going to have to ask the member for Lake Nipigon to withdraw that last comment.

Mr Pouliot: But he sold us out or he bought in, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: You can't withdraw subject to selling out and selling in. You've got to withdraw. Now withdraw.

Mr Pouliot: I will withdraw, Mr Speaker.

1640

WELLAND COURTHOUSE

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): I've got a question to the Attorney General. Some two years ago the government and the Ministry of the Attorney General approved in principle the proposal for the renovation of the Welland courthouse. Since then the Ontario Realty Corp has negotiated with the city of Welland, and those negotiations appear to be complete. You should know that a work order was imposed against that building by the Ministry of Labour, which received a last-minute extension to April 22, which would preclude that building from being used, shutting down any number of trials. This has caused great concern for the judiciary, for the bar, for the city of Welland.

Please, Attorney General, when is the matter of the approval of those renovations — not a capital project for the government but a win-win proposition for the government and important to the function of the courts in Niagara South — going to go to Management Board?

Hon Charles Harnick (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I certainly recognize the urgency in finalizing these plans, and we are working towards that end. Security and space problems have existed in the Welland courthouse for at least six years. The member is quite correct when he talks about an interim safety plan that's now in effect and seems to be working well, and between now and April 22 we hope we can resolve this particular problem. I can tell the member that I've been in touch with the judiciary, I've been in touch with the mayor and we are working towards that end.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Motions? Point of order, the member for Cochrane South.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Comme vous le savez, ici en Ontario on a la Loi 8, faisant affaire avec les services en français. Dans cette loi il y a des sections qui sont très spécifiques quant aux services en français pour les francophones dans les communautés de l'Ontario.

Spécifiquement, dans cette loi on dit qu'il doit y avoir certaines positions désignées dans chacun des ministères : dans le ministère de l'Agriculture, dans le ministère de la Santé, dans le ministère des Services sociaux et dans le ministère du Logement, par exemple. C'est très spécifique que ces ministères ont besoin d'avoir certaines positions désignées sous la Loi 8 et que le gouvernement à ce point-là a besoin de s'engager pour s'assurer que ces positions soient remplies.

Je viens de me rendre compte juste dernièrement, et c'est ma première chance pour soulever cette question, que le gouvernement n'a pas rempli ces positions. Il y a présentement dans la province au-dessus de 500 positions,

désignées sous la Loi 8, qui ne sont pas remplies, et le gouvernement doit suivre la loi —

The Speaker: Member for Cochrane South, I appreciate that's a concern but it really isn't a point of order for the Speaker to be taking up.

Now, I want to just deal with it very directly. I can see the members. I ask you to take your seats. I can see the members now coming up with points of order and points of privilege. I'm not suggesting for a moment they're not of great concern —

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): They are.

The Speaker: — and I'm certain they are, to the member for St Catharines, but I want to tell them that I went to the member for motions. We will proceed properly, and I will take the few motions or points of order that I see, but it's incumbent on the Speaker to ensure the proceedings of the House proceed.

Member for — I'm sorry, it's not going to be that simple. I'm going to move forward. I'll take the points of order but I tell you we're going to get to motions. The member for Lake Nipigon.

M. Gilles Pouliot (Lac-Nipigon) : Sur le même point qui a été mentionné : Je me souviens — vous aussi — que c'était ici dans cette Chambre à l'Assemblée législative, à l'unanimité, que nous avons sanctionné, que nous avons passé la Loi 8. Maintenant nous nous trouvons dans un état de siège. C'est que le gouvernement —

The Speaker: To the member for Lake Nipigon, I need to hear your point of order up front. There's no debate around it. You've got to give me your point of order.

Mr Pouliot: My point of order is in accordance with standing order 24(b), second paragraph, and I'll get right to it. It states emphatically that the government has failed in its commitment to fill 500 unfilled positions within respective ministries to abide by law number —

The Speaker: With the greatest of respect, 24(b) isn't even close; it's 90 minutes, somebody can talk for 90 minutes. Member for Oakwood.

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): Mr Speaker, I don't know if it's appropriate right now, but I'd like to register my dissatisfaction with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his answer.

The Speaker: That's fine, but it's too late for today. It has to be in by 4 o'clock. Member for Fort William.

Mr Colle: Mr Speaker, then how could I have done it?

The Speaker: You could have done it before 4 o'clock.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): Mr Speaker, I'll raise my point of order and it's relevant to the issue raised by the member for Oakwood, specifically 34(a). In respect to the people who have finally been allowed to sit in the members' gallery, I will read the clause. It's a serious point of order.

The Speaker: I want to hear your point of order.

Mrs McLeod: Right. The clause says —

Interjection.

Mrs McLeod: I actually do in order to make my point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: With respect to the member for Fort William, I've read the clause. I'd like to hear your point of order.

Mrs McLeod: The clause says that, "A member...may — I'm abbreviating it; I'm getting to the point — "give notice orally at the end of the oral question period that he or she intends to raise the subject matter of the question" — this is in relationship to when you're dissatisfied — "on the adjournment of the House." That's one thing a member is required to do. The second thing a member is required to do is "give written notice to the Speaker not later than 4 pm the same day."

Mr Speaker, I submit to you that, first of all, I am rising to give notice of dissatisfaction at the end of oral question period as I am required to do. I've met condition number 1. Condition number 2 is that I must give written notice to the Speaker not later than 4 pm, a condition that I cannot meet, because question period has just ended. I've risen as soon as I could —

The Speaker: I can't do anything about that.

Mrs McLeod: Okay. I have also, Mr Speaker, met condition number 3, which was that I would file reasons for dissatisfaction with the Clerk at the table before 5 pm. I have met two of the three conditions in order to serve notice of dissatisfaction. The second point I couldn't meet because question period didn't end until after 4 pm.

The Speaker: I appreciate that, but I can't help you. They're very clear and it's 4 o'clock. If question period didn't end, I am very sorry for that. I don't know who is to blame. All I can tell you is it didn't end. I say to the member for Fort William, it's not a point of order. I don't want to debate it any more; it's not a point of order. It's after 4 o'clock; it wasn't submitted; it's not on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I move we go to orders of the day.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I recognize the government House leader that we move to orders of the day.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. No, I heard your points of order and privilege. I've heard a lot today. I'm not going to hear them till 6 pm. I'm not being unreasonable. I'm not. I'm going to put the motion.

The government House leader has moved that we proceed to orders of the day. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour say "aye."

All opposed say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. It will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1648 to 1718.

The Speaker: Mr Johnson has moved that we proceed to orders of the day.

All those in favour, please rise and remain standing to be counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed?

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 64; the nays are 37.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Report continues in volume B.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 2 April 1997

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Unemployment in the north	
Mr Gravelle	7524
Municipal restructuring	
Mr Marchese	7525
Community care access centres	
Mrs Marland	7525
Amendments to government legislation	
Ms Lankin	7526
Child safety	
Mr Carr	7526
Student referenda	
Mrs McLeod	7529
Hospital restructuring	
Mr Kormos	7530
Epilepsy	
Mrs Johns	7530

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipal restructuring	
Mr Cordiano	7533
Mr Leach	7534, 7535, 7539
Mr Hampton	7535
Mr Silipo	7536
Mr Colle	7539
Ipserwash Provincial Park	
Mr Phillips	7534
Mr Harnick	7534
School boards	
Mr Hampton	7536
Mr Snobelen	7536, 7537
Mr Wildman	7537
Mrs McLeod	7537
Public health programs review	
Mrs Boyd	7538
Mr Wilson	7538
Home care	
Mr Barrett	7539
Mr Jackson	7539
Investigation into police shooting	
Mr Kormos	7540
Mr Runciman	7540
Slow-moving vehicles	
Mr Bert Johnson	7540
Mr Palladini	7540
French-language hospital services	
Mr Morin	7541
Mr Wilson	7541
Welland courthouse	
Mr Kormos	7542
Mr Harnick	7542

OTHER BUSINESS

Time allocation	
Ms Lankin	7515, 7521
Mr David Johnson	7516, 7522
Mr Colle	7516
The Speaker	7517, 7519, 7522, 7523
Mr Silipo	7519

Access to public gallery

Mr Bradley	7517
Mr Silipo	7517
Mrs McLeod	7517, 7527, 7530
The Speaker	7517, 7527, 7530, 7532, 7533
Mr Kormos	7530
Mr Sergio	7532
Mr Wildman	7533
Government advertising	
Mr Wildman	7518
The Speaker	7518
Response to petition	
Mrs Pupatello	7519
The Speaker	7520
Government mail service	
Mr Bradley	7521
The Speaker	7521
Division bells	
Mr Gravelle	7524
The Speaker	7524
Member's statement	
Ms Lankin	7526, 7527
Mr Bradley	7526
Mr David Johnson	7526, 7528
Mr Wildman	7527
Mr Carr	7527
The Speaker	7527, 7528
Mr Silipo	7528
Standing committee on the Legislative Assembly	
Mrs Pupatello	7527
The Speaker	7527
Visitor	
Mr Cordiano	7533
Points of privilege	
Ms Castrilli	7533
The Speaker	7533
Order of business	
Mr David Johnson	7543
Agreed to	7543

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 2 avril 1997

DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

Services en français aux hôpitaux	
M. Lalonde	7525

QUESTIONS ORALES

Services en français aux hôpitaux	
M. Morin	7541

CA2 ON

XI

-D23



No. 176B

N° 176B

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 2 April 1997

Mercredi 2 avril 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 2 April 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 2 avril 1997

Report continued from volume A.

1720

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO

Consideration of Bill 103, An Act to replace the seven existing municipal governments of Metropolitan Toronto by incorporating a new municipality to be known as the City of Toronto / Projet de loi 103, Loi visant à remplacer les sept administrations municipales existantes de la communauté urbaine de Toronto en constituant une nouvelle municipalité appelée la cité de Toronto.

The Chair (Mr Gilles E. Morin): Are there any amendments, and if so, to which sections?

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I have 28 amendments: section 1 of the bill, the definition of "local board"; section 1 of the bill, the definition of "transitional year"; subsection 3(1) of the bill; subsection 3(2), paragraph 1 of the bill; the addition of a section 3.1 to the bill; subsections 4(1) and (2) of the bill; sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2 of the bill; subsection 6(2) of the bill; section 8 of the bill; the addition of a section 8.1 to the bill; section 9 of the bill; section 10 of the bill; section 11 of the bill; section 15 of the bill; subsection 16(4) of the bill; clause 16(5)(b) of the bill; clauses 16(6)(a) and (d) of the bill; subsection 16(12); section 22 of the bill; section 23, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of the bill; the addition of section 23.1 to the bill; clauses 24(1)(a) and (b) of the bill; clause 24(1)(e) of the bill; subsection 24(1.1) of the bill; subsection 24(3) of the bill; clause 25(1)(c) of the bill; section 30 of the bill; the schedule of the bill.

The Chair: Are there any further amendments to the bill?

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): Chair, do you just require the section number at this point? You don't want me to indicate to you the exact nature of each of the amendments?

The Chair: That's correct.

Mr Silipo: I have amendments which we've tabled to subsection 2(9) of the bill; subsection 2(10) of the bill; section 3 of the bill; section 5 of the bill; section 5.1; section 5.2; section 5.3; sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2; subsections 5.1(5) and (6). We have a further amendment to sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2; subsections 5.2(1), (1.1) and (1.2).

We have an amendment to section 7.

We have an amendment to subsection 8(3). We have an amendment to section 8.2 and an amendment to section 8.3.

Section 9: clauses 9(4)(b) and (e); subsections 9(5) and (6); clause 9(7)(b); subclauses 9(8)(a)(i), (ii) and (iii); subsection 9(7.1); subsections 9(8) and (10).

Section 10: clause 10(1)(b); paragraph 6 of subsection 10(2).

Chair, do you want me to continue? Yes? Okay.

Subsection 16(4) and 16(4.1). Clauses 16(a) and (d); subclause 16(6)(d)(iii).

Section 21: 21.1.

Section 23: paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 4.1 and 4.2; also section 23, paragraph 5; also section 23.1.

Section 24: clause 24(1)(a); clause 24(1)(b); subsection 24(1.1); clause 24(1.1)(c); subsection 24(1.2); subsection 24(3). We have many amendments to subsection 24(4), I believe 8,000-plus amendments to this subsection.

Mr Floyd Laughren (Nickel Belt): Eight thousand?

Mr Silipo: Eight thousand, yes.

Section 29.1: There are several amendments here as well.

Section 30: There are also about 700 amendments to this section. Section 30, further amendments: subsection 30(1), (2) and (3).

Chair, we have amendments to every section of the bill.

1730

The Chair: Are there any amendments on the Liberal side?

Mr Mike Colle (Oakwood): Mr Chair, we have tabled amendments to every section of the bill and they are before you on the table.

The Chair: I have before me the first amendment which comes from the Liberal side and I would wish that someone would move the amendment for me.

Interjection.

The Chair: You gave me on Bill 103, package 2(c)(s), if that helps you. Sections 1 to 31 and schedule. Do you have it in front of you?

Mr Colle: I've submitted it to the desk.

Interjection: You have to read it.

Mr Colle: Okay? The first amendment we're making is to section 29.

The Chair: No, before me is sections 1 to 31 and schedule.

Mr Colle: That's right.

The Chair: Would you please move it.

Mr Colle: I'll move those amendments, 1 to 39.

Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of Legislative Services (Ms Deborah Deller): Read it.

Mr Colle: Okay. I'd like to substitute all the amendments we presented to the table for those sections, as you referred to, 1 to 39.

Interjections.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): Mr Chair, I think it may be somewhat unprecedented to have as many amend-

ments before us from all three parties as there are today on Bill 103. I don't know that we have been informed as to the order in which each separate amendment is going to be called. If we can have some indication of that, we can expedite this.

The Chair: We never change the procedure. We always follow from 1 and go down the list. Then the motion has to be read, it has to be moved. Just a minute, please.

Do we have unanimous consent to stand down the first four amendments, which are Liberal amendments, and then I'll proceed with the government amendment? Is it agreed?

Interjections.

Mr Silipo: Mr Chair, a point of order.

The Chair: Could you move, member for Cochrane North, so I can see the gentleman? Go ahead.

Mr Silipo: I can't move an amendment to section 1 because our amendments start at section 2, but I know there is a government amendment to section 1. Rather than wasting the precious time we have, why don't we proceed to deal with the government amendment —

Interjection.

Mr Silipo: Well, obviously, for some reason our Liberal colleagues don't have their amendments in front of them, so let's not waste the time, and get on with it.

The Chair: Let me ask the question again. I have four amendments from the Liberals here, the first four, and I would ask you if we can stand them down. If it is agreed with everyone? Then we will proceed. If you don't agree, then I'll have to let them go. Do you agree with that? You are prepared to wait. Agreed. Therefore I will not proceed.

The amendment I now have before me is a government motion, and I would ask for someone to read the amendment.

Hon Mr Leach: It's a pleasure to accommodate my friends in the Liberal Party. We have an amendment to section 1:

I move that clauses (a) and (b) of the definition of "local board" in section 1 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(a) a neighbourhood committee or community council established under sections 5 or 5.1;

"(b) the financial advisory board established under section 9 or the transition team established under section 16."

Hon Mr Leach: This amendment is required to ensure that the main bodies are not local boards and thus subject to controls of the financial advisory board.

The Chair: Are there any questions or comments?

Mr Silipo: I have some things to say about this particular amendment, but first I want to raise a point of order with respect to it, and by extension with respect to the balance of the proceedings. It's the point I raised with the Speaker earlier today, and I raise it with you now because we are now into it.

My point of order on this specific amendment is that it is out of order because it introduces an element to the bill that was not contemplated in the original bill. I believe that the well-established practice of the parliamentary process that we function under is that you cannot, by amendment to a bill, introduce a new concept that was not part of the original bill. We know that the notion of community councils was not in the original legislation. There certainly

was some discussion during the hearings, but it was not part of the original legislation, so I would make the argument to you that that is out of order.

There are precedents, if you wish, that I can refer to. I will go to them because they might be helpful, if I can just have a second. I know there are a number of precedents on this, but for the sake of brevity I will just refer to a couple. I believe there are decisions that have been made in the House of Commons, particularly, where it has been found, under Speaker Jerome, that this concept applies.

I refer you to the decision of Speaker Jerome listed at Journals of the House of Commons, pages 1418-20. At that instance there was before the House of Commons a bill dealing with immigration to Canada. The Speaker expressed reservations about the procedural acceptability of some amendments and eventually ruled that because certain sections established a new concept, in that case the establishment of an 18-member refugee claims board, which had not been contemplated in the original draft of the bill, those sections were deemed to be out of order.

1740

I make the argument to you here that I think this amendment is out of order. But I also want to raise with you, Chair, the question of how we are going to deal today, because we have similar points to raise on other amendments as we go through them and I don't know, given the limitation of the one hour, where we will be at that point in time, whether we already will have gone beyond the hour by the time we get to dealing with those amendments. At what point will we have the ability to raise those points of order, or is the rule being applied now, the time allocation rule, going to be applied in such a way that at the end of the hour whatever amendments have not been formally moved in the way the minister has just moved this amendment are deemed to have been moved?

We know that by virtue of the time allocation motion, and we don't argue with that at all — where in the process will there be an opportunity for members to raise objections to certain subsections, certain amendments we may not have a chance to deal with in the 40 minutes that are now left, with respect to whether they are in order? I raise a specific point on this amendment, and by extension, Chair, ask you to give us some guidance on how we're going to deal with the balance of the amendments.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): On a point of order, a distinct point, Mr Chair: We believe this is fundamental to the legislative and democratic process. We believe there are well-established precedents in Canada which state that a government cannot bring forward a bill and then, in the process of trying to have that bill passed, in effect rewrite the bill by introducing new concepts. We believe there is well-established precedent for that.

We believe that if the changes are so fundamental as to change the nature of the bill, then the government has no choice but to withdraw the bill and start again. We believe that is what the government is trying to do here with this particular amendment and with other amendments. They are fundamentally changing the nature of the bill, and in our view, there is well-established precedent in Canada that this cannot be done.

We do not believe this is a procedural rule. We believe it is a substantive rule, and the government cannot then

override these substantive rules by simply saying: "There's only an hour. If the substantive issues are not dealt with in an hour, then they have to be passed." The government cannot do, by a back-door procedural motion, what it substantively can't do under the rules of parliaments in Canada.

We believe this is a fundamental issue, and it might be an issue, Chair, which you might want to ask for a recess on so that you can consider it properly.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Chair: There's no question there's going to have to be reflection on this simply because if you examine the government amendment — and the government, when they were announcing this, I think recognized this — many of the amendments they're putting forward, but this specific amendment they're putting forward is somewhat contrary to this bill in the interpretation of some people. Quite obviously they have many methods to deal with it, but the best method of dealing with this amendment, and with other amendments that may be contrary to this bill, is to withdraw the bill and begin the process again to get it right.

That is why we have been taking time this afternoon, allowing the government to reflect all afternoon, and on previous occasions, on the contents of this legislation, because now they're into a circumstance where they want to appear to be responding to the results of the referendum. They aren't, because the referendum clearly rejected the government position completely, but in wanting to appear to be responding to the referendum and perhaps some of the comments that were made at committee, the government is now putting forward these amendments.

My advice to the minister — I know he's eager to receive it and act upon it — is that he withdraw the bill, that he take the bill back to the drawing board, come back later on after he has negotiated, had discussions with the people who made representations with the municipalities, with experts in the field, and come forward with new legislation if he's interested in having new legislation for streamlining local government that does not involve amalgamation into one megacity in Toronto.

Hon David Johnson (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Government House Leader): I wish to assure you there has been a good deal of reflection on this particular bill, and indeed I think the points put forward by the House leader of the Liberals and the leader of the third party indicate that, in their view, the fundamental nature of this bill is preserved, because their view, which they're stating very clearly, is that the bill is essentially the same as it was before and that the bill should be withdrawn. Their voice is clear that they wish to have the bill withdrawn.

Indeed, the fundamental nature of the bill has been preserved. All the amendments have been reviewed by legislative counsel, by the ministry counsel, by the Clerk's office, and it has been ruled by all the authorities that we have spoken to at this point that the amendments are indeed in order, that the amendments are within the scope of the bill, they maintain the fundamental nature of the bill, and I submit to you that to rule them out of order would not be a proper course of action.

Ms Annamarie Castrilli (Downsview): Mr Chair, on the same point: I think the evidence is quite clear, regardless of what the House leader for the party is saying. He has

cited no proposition to support his view. The notion of community councils was not in the original bill. It isn't just a word change; it is in fact a substantial change from the bill.

Let's just be very clear. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms states quite clearly on page 155, section 437, and I'll read both subsections, because I think they both have some play:

First, "An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved," and I think some argument could be made that this particular amendment, this concept, is foreign to the original proposition. It certainly would come as a surprise to anyone who has read the original bill that this is even in keeping with the spirit of the legislation.

Subsection (2) goes on to say, "An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice." Even if you argue under subsection (2) that this is a new question, you are required to give notice, and notice is not given by simply standing up in the House when we are sitting in committee of the whole and saying, "Here is the amendment." That is not what the authorities cite.

It is unfortunate that the government has taken this route, but the amendment they are proposing is out of order, as is any amendment they bring in which does not meet the test I have just read.

Mr Colle: On the same point, I think the crux of this argument is that the original intent of Bill 103 was to establish a one-tier government. What they've done now with these amendments, they've changed that dramatically and they have a two-tier government, because they have installed what they call community councils, which were not in Bill 103. They were not. There was just one line in the original bill which said the city council may establish neighbourhood councils by bylaw. This bill has gone contrary to the original intent of saying one-tier government, one government established, six new governments at the second tier or local level, with chairmen of each one of these new governments.

1750

You can't have it both ways. Either this intention was to have one tier or it was not, but now, all of a sudden, to go in the totally opposite direction and establish a second tier of government that even has an executive and has the ability to spend money, the ability to function as a government, is contrary to the original bill in which the intent is very clear, of one government, one tier, with no mention at all. To introduce this second tier of government in the amendments whereby you have two-tier government again, as faulty as it is or inconsistent as it is or as hollow as it is, it's still contrary. You've got now two tiers where 103, when it was introduced and through first reading, through second reading, through the hearings the minister and his staff emphatically said, "We are going to establish one level of government." With these amendments, the intent is now to establish two tiers; therefore, it's contradictory.

I ask you to rule on it, Mr Chair, and if you cannot rule on it, if you would pass it on to Speaker Stockwell to make this ruling because this at the hub of these amendments. The government is basically making a complete reversal in

its intent and this is not playing by the rules set up by this Legislature where you can't all of a sudden create a new intent and say it's the same bill because it's totally different than the original intent.

Hon Mr Leach: I would like to indicate that nothing could be further from being correct. The community councils are creatures of the council of the whole. They're committees of council. During the hearings that were held in the Legislature and our town hall meetings and in many other sources, we were asked to clarify the role of council and the duties the new council would have. Creating a community council is a role of the new council. They are there at the wish of council of the whole. They have no independent jurisdiction without the approval of council of the whole. The amendment to create community councils is certainly in order. It clarifies the role of council and was certainly the intent of the bill.

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): We don't want to prolong this because of the time. I regret that you've been put in this position, but we're asking for you as Chair to rule, first, on whether or not the concept of community councils was envisioned in the first bill, Bill 103. We contend that it was not and thus it is foreign to the bill and thus would be out of order. We are asking you to rule on that. We're asking you to rule with regard to the ruling cited by my friend from Dovercourt from Mr Speaker Jerome in the House of Commons of Canada with regard to this matter.

Second, we're asking you to give us a ruling with regard to similar amendments that the government has indicated it intends to put during committee and how we will deal with that if the time for debate and raising these kinds of issues is past according to the time allocation motion. It is very important that you as Chair of the committee of the whole House rule.

The Chair: Any further questions or comments on the same amendment before I rule? In my opinion, it doesn't go beyond the scope. It does fall into the general principle of the bill. That is my ruling. Any further questions or comments on the amendment?

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): On a point of order with respect to that, Mr Chair: I would like to challenge your ruling.

The Chair: That's okay, that's fine. The procedure is we will wait for the Speaker to show up.

APPEAL OF CHAIR'S RULING

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): I assume the ruling was appealed.

Ms Lankin: The ruling of the Chair of committee of the whole was in response to a point of order that was placed by the member for Dovercourt with respect to the propriety of the amendment moved by the government. The government's amendment is with respect to creating community councils. It is the contention of our party that that is a notion that is foreign to the original bill and that there are parliamentary precedents which would dictate that it is out of order. The member for Dovercourt has those parliamentary precedents to cite for you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Silipo: The point I made to the Chair of the committee of the whole was that by introducing this concept of community council in the legislation by amendment at this

stage of the proceedings, this amendment was out of order because it introduces a new concept.

I cited in reference and in support of my argument a ruling by Speaker Jerome in the House of Commons on July 21, 1977. I believe there are others, but I cited this one, at which point Speaker Jerome, as he then was, ruled that parts of Bill C-24, which was An Act respecting immigration to Canada, was out of order. Amendments to it were out of order, particularly two of the clauses, two of the motions, because they introduced a new concept into the bill. The concept they introduced in that case was the establishment of an 18-member refugee claims board which had not been contemplated in the original draft of the legislation.

Here we have a similar situation, I would argue, in that the government amendment introduces the concept of community councils here in subsection (1), in the definition section, and then expounds upon it later on in a further amendment. I would say to you that this is introducing a new concept. It's not in the original legislation and therefore, on the basis of established precedent, it should be ruled out of order.

The Speaker: Member for Dovercourt, a question, please: How did Speaker Jerome rule? I don't have it before me.

Mr Silipo: He found that those amendments that introduced this new concept, which he found in that case to be the establishment of an 18-member refugee board, were out of order. That's the parallel I am drawing with this amendment that introduces a new concept here which is a community council, a new entity that is not contemplated in the original legislation.

The Speaker: I'll take it, thank you. Member for St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: I'll defer to the member for Oakwood.
1800

Mr Colle: I think this is quite clear. The language in the bill, the discussions in committee, the pronouncements from the minister continually talked about one-tier government, one unified city. That's all they ever talked about. Their propaganda always talked about one unified city. What they did with these amendments is that at the last minute they made a complete reversal. They said, "Now we have to re-establish the identities of the six cities," so they established in the amendments six community councils. Whether the councils are strong or not is irrelevant. The point is that they've established six new government entities, which means they've gone back to two-tier government, two levels of government, which contradicts the original intent of the bill, which was to get rid of duplication, to get rid of tiers.

That's what the motivation was here: to go with one level of government. Now they have six new governments that can spend money, that can effect local planning, as they say in their amendments, so they've gone away from the original intent. You can't do that in this late stage of the game. This is not the way it should work. They should have introduced a new bill. In fact, in their compendium to the City of Toronto Act, as they say, they indicated they would have to introduce a new bill later on next year to introduce other matters. They couldn't do it in this bill because it would be basically not part of this bill.

Because of public pressure they've said, "Oh, we're going to have to introduce a new level of government again." Either you're going to have one level or you're not. Now they've gone to two, so it's contradictory to the original intent of the bill. You can't do it at this late stage. You could have done it maybe during committee or when we went clause by clause. You can't do it now when we have a one-hour debate.

The Speaker: Thank you, member for Oakwood. Minister.

Hon Mr Leach: Nothing is out of order with this. We were asked during the committee hearings and during our meetings with residents of Toronto throughout the debate and the hearings on this matter. The community councils are a function of council of the whole. They have no powers beyond that of council of the whole. We are responding to what we heard in committee, as I said. The original bill dealt with a new council and this is a clarification of the role of the new council.

This is no different than any committee of any council throughout any municipality in Ontario. Councils set up committees. They control those committees. They can establish them or disband them as they see fit, as can happen to the community councils in this instance. So there's nothing out of order. This is clarifying the role and function of the new city council, which is set out in section 3 of the act.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I need to hear these points of order raised, and it's not helpful for you to be heckling. I ask the question: These neighbourhood community councils are made up of appointed individuals or elected officials?

Hon Mr Leach: They're made up of the elected officials, the same elected officials who sit on council as a whole.

The Speaker: Now I'll entertain more points of order, if you like. I'd like them to be quick, to the point.

Mr Bradley: I think if you look carefully at the legislation, as I know you will, you will see how contrary this particular amendment is to the original bill. The original bill clearly deals with one megacity. This is a chance at appeasement. This is an opportunity for the government to try to appease people, to give the appearance that it is somehow going to take into account the representations which were made at committee. Yet by doing so, by including this amendment, the government is clearly doing something which is contrary to the spirit, surely, of the original legislation, I think to the substance of the original legislation.

Mr Sillipo: In rebuttal to the point the minister made, I think he likes to or tries to portray this as being merely a simple extension of the powers that municipal councils already have. I want to say to you that if that is the case, it doesn't need to be in the legislation.

Second, I want to draw your attention to another ruling which I think has some precedent value in this case: In another instance also by Speaker Jerome, I believe, June 27, 1977 — I will pass this on with the Clerk to you — the government of the day was contemplating extending by amendment the piece of legislation in front of it, Bill C-20 at the time, extending the powers of the Auditor General of Canada by three amendments, expanding the definitions of

"tax expenditure," "tax expenditure budget," thus making a wider range of information available to the Auditor General. Two of the amendments sought to extend the functions of the Auditor General by enabling him, among other things, to examine individual income tax returns.

The example there was an attempt through amendment to expand the powers of in that case the Auditor General, and in this case the municipal councils, and those amendments were found to be unacceptable and out of order, because as the Speaker gave in his reasons, those amendments assign other responsibilities to the Auditor General which are entirely foreign to those envisaged by the legislation. These amendments, therefore, go beyond the scope of the bill and certainly beyond the scope of the clauses to be amended. That's something I would pass to you for your consideration. I think we've got a parallel situation here.

Hon Mr Leach: I would like to carry on with that comment. This is not an expansion of the power of the council. The community councils have no powers other than that provided to them by council.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I need the assistance of the opposition, with greatest respect. These are important matters you're bringing to my attention. They're important amendments and if you're asking for a ruling, you can't keep interrupting them when you don't agree with them. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon Mr Leach: The reason the community councils were put into the legislation is that we were asked during committee, and we were asked by a number of people, how would the council of a single unified city be able to ensure that communities were protected? We suggested, and we put it into the legislation, that the committee of the whole of the new city council divide itself into committees by area. This is not a unique situation. Councils work by committee now; they work by committee of function. What this does is continue to work by committee, but to work by area rather than function. It's not unique, it's not different and it's not out of order.

Mr Wildman: Two points: First, the key point in the ruling of Mr Speaker Jerome cited by my friend for Dovercourt is the word "foreign," that this is foreign to Bill 103. It was not in the original bill. It is something completely new, a new concept.

The second point is, for the minister to argue, first, that these committees are not important so that it doesn't really matter, or on the other hand that they are simply committees of the council which are geographic and, he says, not unique, well, committees of council that are geographic are indeed unique, I think. Having said that, if they are just committees of council then there is no need for them to be in the legislation. Councils can create their own committees. They don't have to be in legislation.

In both cases the amendment is ridiculous and out of order.

Ms Castrilli: Community councils, as we have now heard from the minister, are a brand-new concept. They're both new and foreign, and as has been cited, that is precisely what is objectionable about the community councils.

I really just want to put something else to you which might be of assistance. In Beauchesne's Parliamentary

Rules and Forms, section 437 deals with this pretty specifically. Under subsection (1) it says: "An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved." Therefore, out of order. Even if you rule that this is a new question, not a foreign question to the original purpose of the bill, then subsection (2) goes on to say: "An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice."

This is a clear case of a new concept, a foreign concept which has been introduced at the very last moment. No one knew anything about it, through the hearings, after the hearings, until now. That is a new and foreign concept and therefore out of order.

The Speaker: I appreciate the interest and I know there are points of order you want to get on the record. I'm not going to say you can't get them on the record. What I would like to say, though, is that they need to be germane first and to the point. The member for Oakwood.

Mr Colle: I think there's one defining aspect of this. In the amendments that were made, to show that they've actually created a new tier, which they said they were going to eliminate, they even redefined the boundaries. As you know, originally they were going to use the federal boundaries. In order to re-establish these new entities called community councils, they changed the boundaries to go back to the municipal boundaries used by Metro, so that you have six distinct geographic councils. No matter how it came about, the fact is they reversed course. They now have new, distinct councils established, which is contrary to the original intent of having one level of government, one unified government. Now they've got basically one regional government and they've got six new, distinct regional councils with a chair, budgets, expenditures, obligations and control over things like bylaws, severance etc.

1810

Hon David Johnson: That's very colourful but it isn't factual. In fact there is still one tier; there are not two tiers. What we're talking about is very common in governments: committees. Municipal governments in fact are composed of committees, as you will recall, Mr Speaker, from your previous experience at the municipal level. It's a very common prospect in cities, a very common way of organizing, and there's nothing foreign to the bill. The kinds of responsibilities and duties are exactly the same; precisely the same functions of fire protection, street maintenance, libraries etc. Nothing foreign, nothing new, simply a committee concept which is not foreign in any way, shape or form to the municipal structure.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (Lawrence): This deserves further attention. It's a substantive and profound change that is being made here in the legislation. I think on the point of order, we are arguing that in fact this is a foreign idea.

The Speaker: I gathered that, actually.

Mr Cordiano: Well, you've gathered that, but the point has to be made.

The Speaker: I just need now to figure out what it is you're bringing forward that —

Mr Cordiano: The points have been made and I think ultimately you have to rule in our favour. To lend strength to that argument, it cannot be set aside as a continuation of what was in the bill as intended. So I'm lending strength to your argument to make you rule in favour of decreeing that this is a foreign item that is being introduced as a novel idea. Obviously on that point of order, I would hope that you would vote in our favour.

Ms Lankin: I think most of the points have been made with respect to supporting the point of order by the member for Dovercourt. I simply want to make a point in rebuttal.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and the government House leader in their comments alluded to further amendments that actually establish these councils and suggested that these are just subcommittees of the municipal council which may be set up, and it's up to the municipal council.

I know we are now moving into what it says later in the bill, but I do want to point out to you that under section 5.1, under "Establishment of community councils," it actually says:

"(1) There shall be six community councils, one for each part of the urban area that was an area municipality under the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act."

In fact it is not permissive and not enabling; it is a directive. It says it "shall" establish. These councils that "shall" now be established, not "may be," are not any creature that was envisioned by the original bill.

Mrs McLeod: The government House leader has suggested, in arguing that this is not new or foreign, that it is indeed common for these kinds of committees to be structured. I'm not aware of any comparable example in any jurisdiction in Ontario and indeed in Canada in which there would be committees organized along very specific geographic lines and imposed upon a municipal level of government by the provincial government.

Hon Mr Leach: Just to clarify the point that was made by the member for Beaches-Woodbine, it says, "There shall be...community councils," but later in the bill it also says that those councils are there at the wish of council of the whole, and if they choose to dissolve community councils, that's at the purview of council as a whole, as is any committee that is set up by any municipal government.

The 56 representatives are divided into councils, as they are in any other municipal council, and they work by area rather than function. That's not unique.

Mr Monte Kwinter (Wilson Heights): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Just on that point, the minister is really contradicting himself. The word "shall" mandates. The word "may" is permissive. You can't have it both ways. You can't say you "shall" have this but later on say you "may." You've got to be consistent. There is no discretion. If the legislation is passed and says "shall," then it is mandated. It is not up to the discretion of the council what it does with it. So I would suggest that if that is your intent, you should amend your particular amendment.

The Speaker: I appreciate the opportunity for input from all the members who participated and I am going to take 10 minutes and look at this.

The House recessed from 1816 to 1839.

The Speaker: I'd like to thank the members with their input with respect to this particular amendment. It's a very interesting amendment and also very interesting are the thoughts and ideas that were brought forward.

The fundamental point with respect to this amendment is that it does say in the bill that the council "shall" strike the neighbourhood committees. The fact of the matter remains, in reviewing the bill, that fundamentally one hour later they could abolish the community committees and that means they have the power over these community committees. They also have the power to change, reconfigure and abolish — not change the makeup of the committees or reconfigure, but they can change any decisions taken by the community committees and they can amend any decisions they take. It is a difficult amendment but on balance, if the belief is that the amalgamation is the thrust of the bill, then I believe the thrust is still there with this amendment.

We'll now go back into committee.

House in committee of the whole.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO

(continued)

The Chair: Further questions or comments on this amendment?

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Chair: I just would like to remind you that in raising the previous point of order, which obviously now has been dealt with, I also raised —

Interjections.

Mr Silipo: It's hard to even hear myself.

The Chair: Order.

Mr Silipo: I raised also with you the question more in terms of seeking some guidance from you, Chair, about how we would deal with similar issues that might arise with respect to amendments that we might not have the chance to debate in terms of the time allocation that's left, the 26 minutes that are now left on the clock. If we are into the process after the 26 minutes are up, and of course the amendments are deemed to have been moved by the time allocation motion, does that mean that we are not in a position to raise any point of order with respect to whether we believe certain amendments are out of order, or how are we going to deal with that? I think it's important we know that at this juncture.

The Chair: No problem at all. Once we've gone through the hour and if you have amendments or if you don't agree with a certain amendment, of course you have a point to raise and debate it. Just bring it to my attention.

Mr Silipo: Just so I'm clear, Mr Chair, what you're saying is that even after the hour is over and we are voting on amendment X, at that point, if we have a point of order, you will accept it at that point?

The Chair: If you believe one of the amendments is out of order, you can rise, of course, and mention to me that it's out of order. I will pay attention to it and we'll continue on after that.

Mr Bradley: On a point of clarification, Mr Chair: Is what you are saying this, and I'll give an instance: There is a particular amendment that the government or the opposition has brought forward, somebody challenges the validity of the amendment, in other words, whether that amendment is in order, can we at that time have you go to the Speaker and say to the Speaker, "Would you please rule on whether that's in order or not?"

The Chair: Of course, if anyone wants to appeal my decision, I'll have to go to the Speaker. I have no choice.

Mr Bradley: What you are saying, to get it absolutely right, is that any time during the voice vote on each of these amendments, we can challenge that amendment as to its being in order or not in order?

The Chair: That's correct.

Mr Bradley: Are you going to rule immediately on those challenges?

The Chair: I will rule on it, and if you don't like my ruling, you can appeal it.

Mr Bradley: Thank you. I appreciate your clarification.

Mrs McLeod: Mr Chair, before you move off debate on this particular amendment, I would like to make sure that I have understood the Speaker's ruling that allows this amendment to be in order. I think it's absolutely essential that the record be clear at this point in time, because I believe the Hansard record could be used in interpreting the legislation at some future date.

I understand the Speaker has ruled that the amendment is in order because, although the legislation says that these community councils "shall" be established, it is the Speaker's understanding, confirmed on the basis of the minister's comments, that those community councils could be dissolved within an hour of establishing them by the new mega-council, and that community councils would therefore no longer exist and that the dissolution of the community councils would not be considered to be a violation of the legislation that sets out clearly that these community councils shall be established.

Because this is so contradictory, I think it's essential that the record be clear. The Speaker has said the amendment is in order because although the community councils must be established, they can be dissolved as little as an hour later, and the council, in dissolving them, would not be in violation of the legislation.

If I've understood that correctly, then the minister's contention that this is in fact a response to the concerns that have been presented by the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto becomes completely meaningless, because the community councils may exist for as little as an hour.

The Chair: I have listened you to attentively, and it's not up to me to rule on a ruling of the Speaker, so it's completely out of order and that's it.

Questions or comments on the amendment?

Mr Colle: Just a brief question: In terms of what the Speaker has just ruled —

The Chair: No. Your question has got to be on the amendment that's up, not what the Speaker has ruled. That's finished. That is the end of it. If you have any questions or comments on the amendment that was introduced by the minister, that's what we will deal with, nothing else.

Mr Colle: My question on this amendment is whether the ambiguity here in this amendment in terms of what a neighbourhood council is or neighbourhood committee and community council is — this amendment makes it very ambiguous to where I think even the Speaker confused the two. I think that has got to be straightened out before we proceed, because they're two different entities. I think the Speaker interchanged them and I think this amendment adds to that confusion. That's why I think it is still out of order.

The Chair: Minister, would you like to answer this question?

Hon Mr Leach: Mr Speaker, my apologies, I was busy looking at the amendments. The amendment says that they shall create six councils, and the intent was that they should create six, one for each of the existing municipalities. Then it goes on further to state they would be subject to the — oh, I'm sorry, Mr Speaker. My apologies. No, I have no further question and I'd move that this amendment carry.

Mr Colle: What about this ambiguity about the neighbourhood councils and the mega-council? We are still are confused by this amendment.

Hon Mr Leach: It applies both to neighbourhood committees and community councils, Mr Chair.

1850

The Chair: Any further questions or amendments?

Mr Silipo: I would actually like to make a couple of points with respect to this amendment, if that's in order. I think the exercise that we've just gone through has been a fascinating one. I listened very carefully to the Speaker's ruling and my sense was that he came as close as he could to indicating to the government that they got this one in by a hair.

I found really interesting, as we went through the debate on the point of order, the minister's position on this, which was, if you recall, they've been touting the community councils as one of the big answers to what they heard and how they're responding to what they heard. "We're going to have strong, local bodies," they said, "that are going to respond to and reflect the local wishes." In the same breath the minister turns around and says: "But then it's up to council. They can disband these five minutes after they establish them."

I want to say again, you can't have it both ways, Minister. You know that what you are doing through this amendment for the establishment of the community councils is quite frankly a farce. You're pretending that you are giving people what they said they want, but you're not. You are not substantially because you have chosen to ignore that the fundamental question that people said no to in the referendum was the concept of the megacity or the unified city, as you like to call it.

But what they said no to was you're trying to lambaste this through. You're trying to push this through. You're trying to ram this through in the kind of undemocratic way that you have been doing. You can wrap it up any way you want. You can put these community councils in with these kinds of amendments that say, on the one hand, council has to establish them and then they can turn around and take them out. You know as well as I do that at the end of the day these community councils will be meaningless. They will be meaningless because they will not have any powers, and yet you tried to introduce a new concept in here that hadn't been there before.

It's just one more example, as I see it, of the kind of two-faced approach we have by this government in this piece of legislation. I just find it astounding that this is the way in which this government would pretend they are responding to the concerns that they heard. But actually — no, I have to correct myself. I no longer find it astounding. I'm no longer surprised by the measures to which this government and certainly, in this instance, this minister will go to to try and wrap a draconian measure, which is what Bill 103 is, in nice wrapping as if people will buy that.

I think what the minister needs to understand on this specific amendment and all of the other ones that we won't get a chance to debate is that people out there are not fools. People have more than understood what this minister and this government are doing and people will not forget and people will not go away.

At some point it's conceivable that this bill may pass, but let me be clear with the minister. He should be under no illusion that even if he manages to get this bill passed, that's the end of the process because what he has contributed to, along with Premier Harris, is a real awakening among the population of Metropolitan Toronto through this bill to what this government is all about. No community council concept, no mishmashing of ideas is going to any longer confuse the people of Metropolitan Toronto. They understand the Harris agenda, they understand the Al Leach agenda and they will have no part of it, and we will have no part of it.

We have already said that if we form the next government, and we want to be very clear with people about this, we will put in place a real process that addresses what has to be done in creating a real governance structure for the region which is the greater Toronto area, and within that, looking at what changes need to be made to ensure that there are strong, local, effective councils. Within that, we will then revoke Bill 103 and we will do the work that needs to be done with local politicians and, most important, with the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto to ensure that there is a consensus arrived at.

People are ready for change, people want to see change but they want to see it in a way that is healthy, in a way that takes into concern the best that there is and that is working about local councils, not this mishmash of community councils which have powers, don't have powers, have them one minute, don't have them the next minute, but local councils with real powers that can then relate to a regional government that has real governance responsibilities for what is now the real region, which is the greater Toronto area.

That's what we will continue to talk about, that's what we will continue to work for, and this government is completely missing the boat if they think that with a simple amendment like this establishing community councils that will exist or may exist or may no longer exist two hours or two weeks or two months later, they are appeasing anybody. They are not, and they should at least have the decency to admit that they are not, responding to the essential point that was made by the people of Metropolitan Toronto in the hearings on this bill and certainly in the referendum, which is no, Minister, no to the megacity.

Hon Mr Leach: We listened to the people when they came to the committees and said they wanted strong communities and they wanted the municipal boundaries to be respected. We listened and that's why we put in legislation the creation of community councils because we, as well, believe that communities in existing municipal boundaries should be protected.

However, having done that, come December or November of next year, there will be a new, directly local municipal council, and if you want local democracy to prevail, the new council should have the ability to deal with how that community works by voting either to keep the community

councils, expand the community councils, give them more powers, give them less powers. That's what democracy is, not for the provincial government to come down and say: "We're going to legislate community councils and you will never, ever be able to change it. You will be bound by that forever."

That is not democracy. Democracy is giving the duly elected council in November the ability and the right to see if there's a better way to do it. If there's a better way to do it, we encourage them to do so. At this point in time this government believes by setting up community councils in legislation we are showing the way for the new council, and I hope they would continue with them, but if they find a better way to do it, it is their local, democratic right to choose to do so.

Mr Colle: This is incredible. What I am hearing is talk about local democracy and protecting it. This minister is wiping out six local governments arbitrarily against the will of the people and the citizens who voted overwhelmingly no in the referendum, against all the elected officials, and he talks about respecting local government and local democracy. This is the height of hypocrisy, especially when we've got this proven —

The Chair: Order. Your choice of words is —

Mr Colle: Okay, "inconsistency."

The Chair: Would you please withdraw the word?

Mr Colle: I'll withdraw "hypocrisy."

In terms of this minister then, when he had a chance to stand up for these community councils, a chance here to defend them, what did the minister and the House leader say? "Oh, they're just committees. They can be wiped out. They don't count." This was this minister's answer to saying he listened to people. What they put forth is these counterfeit councils. They're a farce, as this whole bill and this whole process is. You haven't respected people, and then to tell people that you're going to have a local government of 57 members — talk about farces. You can imagine how you're going to be able to engage in a debate or deputations to — there's no such thing in Canada — a 57-member council.

1900

The only attempt the minister had to water that down and give local autonomy a say was maybe re-establishing local government. All he has done is put up these counterfeit, fraudulent, patronizing committees that are just a testament to the arrogance of this minister and this government to all the citizens who voted no to this megacity bill. They won't be bought off by this fraudulent attempt to appease them, because they're smarter than you are, Minister. They're not going to be fooled by these counterfeit councils. You just stood up in this House and said they were counterfeit, you said they were meaningless, and you encouraged the Chair to rule they were meaningless. That's what you think of these councils. They're counterfeit, as this bill is counterfeit.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Riverdale): I just found it incredible listening to the minister lecture us about democracy here, trying to explain that that's what this section of the bill is all about. In a way, the very thing we're debating here today is the absolute lack of democracy in this whole process. Minister, you may think that by making these amendments today you're actually providing democracy,

which is what part of what the No coalition was all about: the lack of process. In fact, from my reading of that amendment, what you've just said — and I'm going to choose my words carefully; we have a few minutes left here — is misinterpreting perhaps. I don't have it in front of me, but if you look at it, some of the things you're saying it does are not even there, these things about the committee of adjustment. What you're saying, in my view, is the opposite of what's actually in writing.

It's the height of ridiculousness to stand here and try to pretend — I chose that word carefully — that what you're doing with this is actually providing more democracy.

These amendments in general — we're not going to have an opportunity to talk about them in general; soon our time, the hour for actual debate, even though we'll go on, will be up. But I want to say to you here and now, Minister, we still want you to withdraw this bill, and it's a very serious request. As you know, the large percentage of Metro voters voted no, and there's a basic, fundamental flaw. We're going to be putting forth a lot of amendments, but nothing can really fix this bill.

I'm going to ask you now, in the few minutes we have left in this hour, to still seriously think about withdrawing it. It is not too late. The sky is not going to fall. There is still time to work with the people in a democratic way to come up with some solutions. Pretty well everybody has said that the status quo is not acceptable. We have to work on the whole greater Toronto area first and figure out how to coordinate those services, then sit down, as we've proposed to you, and start working out the best municipal representation within that structure that is democratic so people feel they are — and are — represented democratically.

I would ask the minister now if he would still consider today withdrawing this bill and starting all over again. It is not too late. We can still do this right.

Mr Mario Sergio (Yorkview): Mr Chair, I wonder if you or perhaps the minister, Mr Leach, could clarify the problem we are having with clause 1(a). I'm reading from the amendment. Do you have Bill 103 with you, Mr Chair?

The Chair: Yes, I have the amendment.

Mr Sergio: I'm having difficulty, because the amendment from the minister calls for an amendment to section 1, amending (a) and (b). Part (a) refers to "a neighbourhood committee or community council established under section 5 or 5.1." Now, I want to call your attention to page 5, under section 5. There is no 5.1. Can you please explain to me, can you please have Mr Leach explain, where 5.1 comes into the picture?

Hon Mr Leach: Government amendment number 7 deals with that question, and I would refer the member to the government's amendment.

Mr Sergio: This is the problem we are having and that the public is having, because the amendment in front of us doesn't say anything with respect to amendment 7 or whatever other 7. It deals strictly with amending (a) and (b) and to find that amendment in section 5 or 5.1. It does not say anything about, "Go and find that in section 7."

This shows you how convoluted this bill is. It has been drawn up in such a rush that even the minister doesn't know the content of the bill. I would like to have a clear-cut explanation of where we can find and address this community council under 5.1 of the government's amendment.

Hon Mr Leach: We provided copies of our amendments to the opposition parties almost a week ago, a courtesy, I might point out, that wasn't extended to us. I would suggest that if the member read the entire package, he might see where that issue is dealt with, and it's dealt with under amendment 7; that's where that's dealt with. I would suggest that the member read the entire package and inform himself of the changes we're making.

Mr Sergio: That's unacceptable. We are dealing with the community councils in section 1 of the entire bill itself, and this was amended with their own amendment. This amendment does not say to go and find that amendment in section 7. With all due respect, this must be addressed, and the only way it can be addressed properly is if the minister does the right thing and — I don't know if you're listening, Mr Chair. Are you listening, Mr Chair? Well, I'm addressing it directly to the minister: If you want to do the right thing, you should withdraw the bill now, defer it and get it right, because you have no idea what's in your own bill.

You just cannot address the community councils, as you have said in your own amendment to clause 1(a), and then say, "Well, if it's not in this particular clause here, go and look in section 7." Any citizen out there who would read your own amendment would have to find that community council in clause 1(a). With all due respect, I'm requesting that you give us either a fair, good explanation, or you consider deferring the entire bill until you get it right.

Hon Mr Leach: You owe me one.

Ms Lankin: Thank you very much. For giving me the remaining 23 seconds, the minister says I owe him one. I want to say to you, Minister, there is so much that needs to be debated, there is so much that needs to be said about this flawed process, about the way in which your government has rolled over the public of Metropolitan Toronto, shown disrespect for the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto, all I can say is that you should be ashamed. This is the darkest day in the history of the Legislature of Toronto.

The Chair: On January 29, we passed the following motion:

That one hour shall be allotted to consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House. At the end of that time, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Any divisions required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put, the members called in once, and all deferred divisions taken in succession. All amendments proposed to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the Assembly by 2 pm on the sessional day on which the bill is considered in committee of the whole House and that, notwithstanding standing order 9(a), the House be authorized to meet beyond its normal adjournment time until completion of the committee of the whole stage of Bill 103.

1910

All of the amendments have been deemed to have been moved and I will now put the questions on all sections of the bill, starting with the government amendment to section 1:

"I move that clauses (a) and (b) of the definition of 'local boards' in section 1 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"the neighbourhood committee or community council established under sections 5 or 5.1;

"the financial advisory board established under section 9 of the transition team established under section 16."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. As agreed, the vote will be deferred.

We will now deal with the Liberal amendment to section 1, the definition of "transitional year."

"I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by striking out the definition of 'transitional year,' and substituting the following:

"'transitional period' means the period beginning on the day this act receives royal assent and ending on December 31, 2000."

Shall the amendment carry?

Mr Silipo: A point of order: You said it was a Liberal amendment, and it's a government amendment, is it not?

The Chair: No, it's a Liberal amendment.

Mr Silipo: I could swear that the words I was following were exactly the government amendment, but okay.

The Chair: What I have before me is the Liberal amendment. For your information, Mr Silipo, the Liberal one says "December 31, 2000," and the government says "December 1, 1997."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it.

We will now deal with the government motion on section 1, the definition of "transitional year."

"I move that the definition of 'transitional year' in section 1 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"'transitional period' means the period beginning on the day this act receives royal assent and ending on December 31, 1997."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." I declare the motion carried. The vote is deferred.

We'll now deal with a Liberal motion, adding sections 1.1 to 1.3.

"I move that part I of the bill be amended by adding the following sections:

"Municipal referenda or plebiscites binding

"1.1 The government of Ontario acknowledges that it is bound by the results of the municipal referenda or plebiscites conducted in the urban area on March 3, 1997. If a majority of voters answered a question posed in the referenda or plebiscites referred to in subsection (1) in the negative, this act shall be deemed to be repealed on the day it received royal assent.

"Timing

"The government of Ontario acknowledges that the creation of the new city shall not be driven by external deadlines such as the regular municipal elections of 1997, but shall be carried out responsibly and properly following careful analysis and in accordance with the expressed

wishes of the people and the advice of local elected officials.

"Municipal property taxes in the old municipalities and in the new city shall not be increased as a result of the implementation of this act or as a result of any other provincial restructuring of the delivery or funding of services.

"Municipal facilities and services in the old municipalities and in the new city shall not be reduced in order to comply with subsection (1).

"Cost of implementation

"Any increase in municipal expenditures in the old municipalities or in the new city that result from the implementation of this act or from any other provincial restructuring of the delivery or funding of services shall be funded by the government of Ontario."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): On a point of order, Mr Chair: When members vote, are they not supposed to be in their seats that they usually occupy in the House? There are a number of members in the House who are voting without being in their proper seats.

The Chair: It's a voice vote and, of course, we don't pay attention to it but the members have to be in their seats.

We will now deal with a Liberal motion to subsection 2(1):

"I move that subsection 2(1) of the bill be amended by striking out 'January 1, 1998,' in the first line and substituting 'January 1, 2001.'"

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We will now deal with another amendment brought in by the Liberals:

"I move that clause 2(5)(b) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"All the assets and liabilities that the old municipalities had on December 31, 2000, are vested in and become assets and liabilities of the new city on January 1, 1998, without compensation."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We'll now deal with another amendment by the Liberals, subsection 2(5.1).

"I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"The new city holds in a reserve or reserve fund acquired from an old municipality under clause 5(b) in trust for the residents of a geographic area or jurisdiction of that old municipality and shall deal with them only for the benefit of those residents."

1920

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Please take your seat. The vote is deferred.

I now have an NDP motion.

"I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Local boards

"(9) Every local board of an old municipality that is in existence immediately before the coming into force of section 27,

"(a) shall be deemed to be a local board of the new city; and

"(b) is continued, in respect of the part of the urban area over which it had jurisdiction immediately before the coming into force of section 27, until the council passes a bylaw to provide otherwise."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal again with an NDP motion, subsection 2(10).

"I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Official plans

"(10) Every official plan of an old municipality that is in force immediately before the coming into force of section 27,

"(a) shall be deemed to be an official plan of the new city; and

"(b) remains in force, in respect of the part of the urban area to which it applied immediately before the coming into force of section 27, until it is amended or replaced in accordance with the Planning Act."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

I now have a Liberal motion.

"I move that clause 3(1)(b) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"One member elected for each of the wards established under section 4."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal with a government motion.

"I move that subsection 3(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"The council of the new city is composed of,

"(a) the mayor, elected by general vote; and

"(b) 56 other members, two of whom shall be elected for each ward."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal with an NDP motion.

"I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Election campaign spending limit, mayor

"(1.1) For the purposes of subsection 76(4) of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, the maximum amount of election campaign expenses that a candidate for the office of mayor may incur is fixed at \$200,000, and the prescribed formula referred to in that subsection does not apply."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal with a Liberal motion.

"I move that subsection 3(2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(2) The following special rules apply to the members of the council elected in the 2000 regular election:

"Despite section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, the members' terms of office begin on January 1, 2001."

"Despite subsection 49(1) of the Municipal Act, the first meeting of the council shall be held on January 2, 2001."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal with a government motion.

"I move that paragraph 1 of section 3(2) of the bill be amended by striking out 'section 10 of the Municipal Elections Act' and substituting 'section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996.'"

Shall the amendment — point of order?

Mr Silipo: Yes. This is another one of those amendments on which I indicated earlier that we may have a point of order, and I want to just raise it now. I believe this particular amendment is out of order. The reason for that, and I will be brief because I appreciate the process that we're going through: I believe there are accepted precedents in this House and in other parliaments that say very clearly that an amendment may not amend sections from the original act unless they are specifically being amended in a clause of the bill before the committee.

This amendment, as you see, tries to replace section 10 of the Municipal Elections Act with section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996. I have not been able to find in the original bill any references to section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, and so I believe this is contrary to accepted practice, which does not allow an amendment to be put that would amend a clause in a bill which is not before the committee. Section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act is not before the committee; it hasn't been before the Parliament, before the committee, by virtue of not being in the original bill. I think in that instance it then needs to be ruled out of order.

The Chair: This motion is in order because the effect is not to amend a clause because, if you read, it says very clearly, "despite subsection (49)." "Despite." So it doesn't amend the clause itself.

We will proceed with the vote on this motion. Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the "ayes" have it. The vote will be deferred.

We now deal with a government motion.

"I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Executive committee

"3.1 (1) There shall be an executive committee of council consisting of the mayor and the chairs of the six community councils.

"Dissolution or change

"(2) The council may, by bylaw, dissolve the executive committee or change its composition."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote will be deferred.

We now deal with a government motion.

"I move that subsections 4(1) and (2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Wards

"(1) The urban area is divided into 28 wards, as described in the schedule."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

1930

We are now dealing with a Liberal motion.

"I move that subsections 4(1) and (2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"The Ontario Municipal Board shall, by order, divide the urban area into an even number of wards. Before establishing the number and boundaries of the wards, the Ontario Municipal Board shall hold public consultation."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

We now deal with an NDP motion.

"I move that the government motion to strike out section 5 of the bill and substitute sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2 be amended by adding the following subsection to section 5:

"Public consultation

"(3) Despite subsection (1), no bylaw shall be passed unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The clerk has given notice of the proposed bylaw, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of the part of the urban area to be represented by the neighbourhood council.

"2. The council has considered all written submissions made by those residents and received by the clerk within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more of those residents requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the council has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The clerk shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed bylaw,

"ii. tell residents where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise residents of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

"iv. advise residents where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Now to a government motion:

"I move that section 5 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Neighbourhood committees

"(1) The city council may, by bylaw, establish neighbourhood committees and determine their functions.

"Number

"(2) The number of neighbourhood committees shall be fixed in the bylaw.

"Establishment of community councils

"5.1(1) There shall be six community councils, one for each part of the urban area that was an area municipality under the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

"Composition

"(2) Each community council is composed of the members of the city council elected for each ward in the part of the urban area represented by the community council.

"Chair

"(3) The members of each community council shall elect a chair from among themselves; in the event of a tie, the chair shall be chosen by lot.

"Committee of council

"(4) Each community council is a committee of the city council for all purposes.

"Dissolution or change

"(5) The city council may, by bylaw,

"(a) dissolve a community council or change its composition;

"(b) establish a new community council for any part of the urban area.

"Same

"(6) The following rules apply to the bylaw:

"1. The bylaw may dissolve all the community councils without establishing new ones.

"2. If the bylaw establishes new community councils, every part of the urban area shall be represented by a community council.

"3. No ward shall be represented partly by one and partly by another community council.

"4. Only members of the city council may be members of a community council.

"Local planning and committee of adjustment functions

"5.2 (1) The city council may, by bylaw, assign to the community councils any of the following functions with respect to the parts of the urban area that they represent:

"1. Functions in connection with local planning matters that the Planning Act allows the council to delegate to a committee of council, an appointed committee or an appointed official.

"2. The functions of a committee of adjustment under the Planning Act.

"Recreational facilities

"(2) The city council may, by bylaw, assign to a community council the management on behalf of the new city of one or more recreational facilities (such as arenas, community centres and parks) located in the part of the urban area that the community council represents.

"Spending limits

"(3) In managing a recreational facility, a community council shall not incur expenses that exceed the amount allocated by the city council.

"Additional functions

"(4) The city council may, by bylaw, assign to the community councils, with respect to the parts of the urban area that they represent, a function that is prescribed under subclause 24(1)(e)(i).

"Conditions

"(5) A bylaw passed under subsection (4) may impose conditions on the exercise of the function by the community councils.

"Effect of assignment

"(6) When a bylaw passed under subsection (4) is in force, the city council is obliged to pass any bylaw recommended to it by the community council if the following conditions are met:

"1. The recommended bylaw relates to a function that has been assigned to the community councils by the bylaw passed under subsection (4).

"2. The city council has allocated to the community council sufficient funds for any expenditure arising from the recommended bylaw.

"Revocation of assignment

"(7) The city council has power to revoke an assignment of functions by passing a bylaw amending or revoking a bylaw passed under subsection (1), (2) or (4)."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Bert Johnson): An NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out section 5 of the bill and substitute sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2 be amended by striking out subsection 5.2(1) and substituting the following:

"Planning functions

"(1) The city council may, by bylaw, assign to the community councils any of the following functions with respect to the parts of the urban area that they represent:

"1. Functions in connection with planning matters that would otherwise belong to the city council, including the passing of zoning bylaws.

"2. Functions in connection with planning matters that the Planning Act allows the city council to delegate to a committee of council, an appointed committee or an appointed official.

"3. The functions of a committee of adjustment under the Planning Act.

"Conflict

"(1.1) A bylaw passed under subsection (1) applies despite the Municipal Act, the Planning Act or any other act.

"Other functions

"(1.2) The city council may, by bylaw, assign to the community councils any of the following functions with respect to the parts of the urban area that they represent:

"1. Functions in connection with licencing.

"2. Functions in connection with local roads.

"3. Functions in connection with waste disposal and recycling.

"4. Functions in connection with arts funding.

"5. Functions in connection with animal control."

Is it the wish of the House that the amendment carry? All

those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: The member for Cochrane South will come to order.

An NDP motion.

"I move that the government motion to strike out section 5 of the bill and substitute sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2 be amended by adding the following subsections to section 5:

"Public consultation

"(3) Despite subsection (1), no bylaw shall be passed unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The clerk has given notice of the proposed bylaw, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of part of the urban area to be represented by the neighbourhood council.

"2. The council has considered all written submissions made by those residents and received by the clerk within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more of those residents requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the council has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The clerk shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed bylaw,

"ii. tell residents where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise residents their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise residents where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of the committee that the amendment carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

1940

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out section 5 of the bill and substitute sections 5, 5.1, 5.2 be amended by striking out subsections 5.1(5) and (6) and substituting the following:

"Changes

"(5) The city council may, by bylaw,

"(a) change the composition of a community council;

"(b) dissolve a community council and establish a new one.

"Same

"(6) The following rules apply to the bylaw:

"1. Every part of the urban area shall be represented by a community council.

"2. No ward shall be represented partly by one and partly by another community council.

"3. Only members of the city council shall be members of a community council."

Is it the wish of the committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out section 5 of the bill and substitute sections 5, 5.1, 5.2 be amended by striking out subsection 5.2(7)."

Is it the wish of the committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that subsection 6(2) of the bill be amended by striking out 'municipal corporation' in the third and fourth lines and substituting 'municipal commission.'"

Is it the wish of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that subsection 6(4) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Transfer of certain assets and liabilities

"(4) All the assets and liabilities relating to the distribution and supply of electrical power that were controlled and managed by the old municipality on December 31, 2000, are vested in and become assets and liabilities of the new city under the control and management of the commission on January 1, 2001, without compensation."

Is it the wish of the committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

Shall section 7 carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Chair: You called the vote on a section?

The Second Deputy Chair: A whole section, yes.

Mr Silipo: But there's an amendment that we have on section 7.1. So it's a new section.

The Second Deputy Chair: The vote shall be deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Toronto Transit Commission

"Commission continued

"7.1 The Toronto Transit Commission is continued under the name of "Toronto Transit Commission" in English and "Commission de transport de Toronto" in French and is responsible for the public transit in the urban area."

Is it the wish of the committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 8 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Employees of old municipalities and local boards

"8. A person who is an employee of an old municipality or of a local board of an old municipality on December 31, 2000, and would, but for this act, still be an employee of the municipality or local board on January 1, 2001, is an employee of the new city or one of its local boards on January 1, 2001."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that section 8 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Employment continuous

"(2) A person's employment with an old municipality or local board shall be deemed not to have been terminated for any purpose by anything in subsection (1)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 8 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Minimum notice period

"(3) After section 27 comes into force, an employee referred to in subsection (1) is entitled to six months' notice of termination or to the period of notice of termination provided by the applicable employment contract or collective agreement, whichever is greater."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Municipal assets

"8.1. Nothing in this act gives the government of Ontario access to assets of any old municipality or the new city, including reserves and reserve funds."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? It is carried. No? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Reserves and reserve funds

"8.2. Reserves and reserve funds of each old municipality shall be spent only for the benefit of residents of the relevant part of the urban area."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Transition funds

"8.3. The amount of reserves and reserve funds of old municipalities that pass to the new city under section 2 shall not be taken into consideration in determining eligibility for transition funds from the province."

Is it the wish of this committee that the motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 9 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Board of advisers

"9(1) There shall be a board of advisers consisting of one or more members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

"Duties

"(2) The board of advisers shall

"(a) observe the affairs of the old municipalities during the transition period;

"(b) report to the minister at his or her request;

"(c) cooperate with the transition team.

"Primacy of local elected officials

"(3) The board of advisers has no power to override local decision-making or interfere with the activities of the local elected officials.

"No retroactivity

"(4) The board of advisers has no power to act before this section comes into force.

"Dissolution

"(5) The board of advisers is dissolved on January 31, 2001."

1950

Is it the wish of this committee that the motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out clauses 9(4)(b) and (3)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking clause (7)(b)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out subclause 9(8)(a)(i) and substituting the following:

"(i) furnish information, records or documents that are in the possession or would normally be available to members of the public."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out subclause 9(8)(a)(ii)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

I have an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out clauses 9(4)(b) and (e)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out subclauses 9(8)(a)(iii) and substituting the following:

"(iii) update earlier information furnished under this subsection."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Same

"(7.1) Subsection (7) does not entitle the members, employees and agents of the board of trustees to a higher level of cooperation or compliance than members of the public are entitled to receive."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

Interruption.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would you please remove that person.

NDP motion:

"Delegation to one or more members

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection (8)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 9 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection (10)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion; a little lengthy:

"I move that section 9 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Financial advisory board

"(1) There shall be a financial advisory board consisting of one or more members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may designate one of the members as chair.

"Body corporate

"(2) The financial advisory board is a body corporate.

"Remuneration and expenses

"(3) The members of the financial advisory board shall paid the remuneration fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the reasonable expenses incurred in the course of their duties under this act.

"Duties

"(4) The financial advisory board shall,

"(a) consider 1997 operating and capital budgets under section 11;

"(b) consider requests for approval under section 10 and grant them when the board considers it appropriate;

"(c) report to the Minister at his or her request;

"(d) cooperate with the transition team;

"(e) carry out any other prescribed duties.

"Guidelines

"(5) The financial advisory board,

"(a) shall establish and publish guidelines with respect to,

"(i) payments and agreement to payments in connection with the ending of an employment relationship, as referred to in paragraph 5 of subsection 10(2);

"(ii) appointments, hiring and promotion, as referred to in paragraph 6 of that subsection;

"(b) may establish and publish guidelines with respect to matters referred to in paragraphs 1 to 4 of the subsection 10(2).

"Same

"(6) The guidelines do not apply to the new city or to its local boards.

"Cooperation, access to information

"(7) The members of each old council, employees and agents of the old municipality and members, employees and agents of each local board and of an old municipality shall,

"(a) cooperate with members, employees and agents of the financial advisory board, assist them in the performance of their duties and comply with their requests under this act;

"(b) on request, allow any person described in clause (a) to examine and copy any document, record or other information in the possession of the old municipality or local board, as the case may be, that is relevant to the functions of the financial advisory board.

"Powers

"(8) Without limiting the generality of subsection (7), the financial advisory board has power to,

"(a) require and old council or a local board of an old municipality to,

"(i) furnish information, records or documents that are in its possession and are relevant to the functions of the financial advisory board,

"(ii) create a new document or record that is relevant to the functions of the financial advisory board by compiling existing information, and furnish the document or record, and

"(iii) update earlier information furnished under this subsection; and

"(b) impose a deadline for compliance with a requirement under clause (a).

"Delegation

"(9) The financial advisory board may authorize one or more of its members to act on its behalf.

"Staff, facilities and services

"(10) The financial advisory board may hire staff, arrange for facilities and obtain expert services as it considers necessary to perform its functions.

"Dissolution of board

"(11) The financial advisory board is dissolved on January 31, 1998."

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 10 of the bill be amended by striking out clause 10(1)(b) and substituting the following:

"Restrictions on powers of old councils and local boards

"(b) the old council's or local board's budget provides for the act."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

2000 This is an NDP motion:

"Board approval

"I move that the government motion to strike out and replace section 10 of the bill be amended by striking out paragraph 6 of subsection 10(2)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that section 10 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Transactions during transitional period

"10(1) During the transitional period, an old council or a local board of an old municipality shall not do an act described in subsection (2) unless,

"(a) the act is done in accordance with a guideline established under subsection 9(5); or

"(b) the old council's or local board's budget specifically provides for the act, has been submitted to the financial advisory board and considered by it under subsection 11(1) and (3), and has been dealt with by the old council or local board under subsection 11(5), if applicable.

"Same

"(2) Subsection (1) applies to the following acts:

"1 Conveying an interest in property whose original purchase price or actual current value exceeds \$100,000.

"2 Purchasing an interest in property for a price that exceeds \$100,000.

"3 Transferring money between or among reserves or reserve funds, or changing the purpose or designation of a reserve or reserve fund.

"4 Entering into a contract or incurring a financial liability or obligation that extends beyond the end of the transitional year.

"5 Making or agreeing to make a payment in connection with the ending of an employment relationship, except in accordance with a contract or collective agreement entered into before the day this section comes into force.

"6 Appointing a person to a position, hiring a new employee or promoting an existing employee.

"Exception

"(3) Subsection (1) does not prevent an old board or a local board of an old municipality from,

"(a) doing anything that it is otherwise required to do by law;

"(b) taking action in an emergency.

"Same

"(4) Subsection (1) does not prevent the performance of a contract entered into before the day this section comes into force.

"Same

"(5) Subsection (1) does not prevent an act that is,

"(a) approved by the financial advisory board; or

"(b) provided for by a bylaw or resolution that also contains a provision to the effect that it shall not come into force until the approval of the financial advisory board has been obtained.

"Time for approval, conditions

"(6) The financial advisory board may approve an act under clause (5)(a) in advance or retroactivity, and in either case may impose conditions on the approval.

"Retroactive effects

"(7) Guidelines made under subsection 9(5) may, if they so provide, apply to acts done before the guidelines are published."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry?

I declare the motion carried.

Interjections: No.

The Second Deputy Chair: I said, "Shall it carry?" and it carried. I didn't see or hear a "No." Was there a "No"? There was a "No." If there was a "No," I stand corrected.

All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 10 of the bill be struck out."

I'm ruling that this is out of order, as the procedure exists to simply vote against it instead of striking out the section.

This is a Liberal motion:

"The Liberal members of the committee recommend that the committee vote against section 10."

I'm ruling this out of order, as it's not an amendment, but a reminder simply to vote against section 10.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 11 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Annual operating and capital budgets

"11. Each year during the transitional period, each local council and each local board of an old municipality shall provide the board of advisers with a copy of its operating and capital budget for the year."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that section 11 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"1997 budgets

"11(1) Each old council and each local board of an old municipality shall, by a date fixed by the financial advisory board, submit to the board,

"(a) the old council's or local board's final operating and capital budgets for 1997;

"(b) a statement of its actual operating capital expenditures for the first quarter of 1997; and

"(c) a forecast of its operating expenditures for the second, third and fourth quarters of 1997.

"Quarterly spending report

"(2) Within 14 days after the end of each of the second, third and fourth quarters of 1997, each old council and local board shall submit to the financial advisory board a report,

"(a) comparing actual operating expenditures for that quarter to the amount forecast in the budget; and

"(b) stating capital expenditures for that quarter.

“Consideration of budgets and reports

“(3) When material submitted under subsection (1) or (2), the financial advisory board shall consider it and give the old council or local board a written response indicating,

“(a) what concerns the financial advisory board has in connection with the material submitted; or

“(b) that it has no concerns, if that is the case.

“Example

“(4) Without limiting the generality of subsection (3), when the financial advisory board considers a budget it shall consider the extent to which planned spending includes appropriations from reserves and reserve funds.

“Duty of old council or local board

“(5) If the financial advisory board expresses concerns under subsection (3) in connection with the material submitted under subsection (1), the old council or local board shall consider them and,

“(a) change the budget in response to the concerns; or

“(b) confirm the budget as submitted to the financial advisory board.

“Same

“(6) If the financial advisory board expresses no concerns under subsection (3), the old council or local board need take no further action.

“Meeting open to public

“(7) Any decisions required by subsection (5) shall be made at a meeting that is open to the public.

“Local board without own budget

“(8) A local board whose budget forms part of the overall budget of an old council is not required to submit material under subsection (1) or (2).

“Extension of time

“(9) The financial advisory board may, at the request of an old council or local board, extend a time limit fixed under subsection (1) or a time limit set out in subsection (2), may do so retroactively and may impose conditions on the extension.

“Alternate reporting periods

“(10) An old council or local board may, if it obtains the approval of the financial advisory board in advance, express the statements, forecasts and reports required by subsections (1) and (2) in terms of a specified reporting period other than a quarter.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

“The government recommends that members of the committee vote against section 12.”

I’m not sure whose amendment. Whose motion is it? I don’t care whose it is, it’s out of order.

This is a Liberal motion:

“Liberal members of the committee recommend the committee vote against section 12.”

This is out of order.

This is a Liberal motion:

“I move that section 12 of the bill be struck out.”

I’m ruling it out of order.

This is a Liberal motion on section 12:

“I move that section 12 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Application of JRPA and SPPA

“12. The Judicial Review Procedure Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act apply to the board of trustees.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

“The Liberal members of the committee recommend the committee vote against section 13.”

I’m ruling it out of order.

Interjections.

It does so say “Liberal motion.”

“I move that section 13 of the bill be struck out.”

I’m ruling it out of order.

Shall section 13 carry? All those in favour of section 13 carrying say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

2010

The government recommends that members of committee vote against section 14, and I’m ruling that out of order.

This is a Liberal motion to section 14:

“I move that section 14 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Expenses

“14. Expenses of the board of advisors, including the remuneration expenses of its board, shall be paid by the government of Ontario.”

I am ruling this out of order as it directs public funds.

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex South): On a point of order, Chair: In that motion you said the expenses of its board shall be paid; it reads “expenses of its members shall be paid.”

The Second Deputy Chair: This says “expenses of the board,” but I’m ruling it out of order.

Shall section 14 of the bill carry? The section does not carry.

This is a government motion:

“I move that section 15 of the bill be amended by striking out ‘board of trustees’ in the second line of subsection (1) and in clause (2)(a) and substituting in both cases ‘financial advisory board’.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

“I move that section 16 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Transition team

“16(1) There shall be a transition team consisting of one or more members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

“Duties

“The transition team shall,

“(a) consider what further legislation may be required to implement this act, and make detailed recommendations to the minister;

“(b) work with the old councils and the local boards of the old municipalities to ensure a smooth transition to ensure that levels of service remain consistent during the transitional period;

“(c) hold public consultations on the implementation of this act;

“(d) make recommendations to the new council;

“(e) report to the minister at his or her request;

“(f) cooperate with the board of trustees.

“Primacy of locally elected officials

“(2) The transition team has no power to override local decision-making or interfere with activities of locally elected officials.

“Dissolution

“(3) The transition team is dissolved on January 31 in the year 2001.”

Is it the wish of this House that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

“I move that subsection 16(4) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Duties

“(4) The transition team shall,

“(a) consider what further legislation may be required to implement this act, and make detailed recommendations to the minister;

“(b) establish the key elements of the new city’s organizational structure and hire, in accordance with section 17, the municipal officers required by statute and any other employees of executive rank whom the transition team considers necessary to ensure the good management of the new city;

“(c) hold public consultations on,

“(i) the functions to be assigned for neighbourhood committees and the method of choosing their members,

“(ii) the functions to be assigned to the community councils and the executive committee, and

“(iii) the rationalization and integration of municipal services across the new city and associated opportunities for savings;

“(d) give the old councils opportunities to meet with the transition team to discuss the matters described in subclauses (c)(i), (ii) and (iii);

“(e) before December 31, 1997, make detailed recommendations to the new council on,

“(i) the matters referred to in subclauses (c)(i), (ii) and (iii),

“(ii) a procedure bylaw for the purposes of subsection 55(2) of the Municipal Act,

“(iii) the remuneration of the mayor, the community chairs and the other members of council, and

“(iv) transitional issues;

“(f) prepare and submit to the new council for its consideration a proposed operating and capital budget for 1998 that provides for property tax stability and continuity of service delivery;

“(g) report to the minister at his or her request;

“(h) cooperate with the financial advisory board;

“(i) carry out any other prescribed duties.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that the government motion to strike out and replace subsection 16(4) of the bill be amended by striking out clause 16(4)(i).”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

A government motion:

“I move that clause 16(5)(b) of the bill be amended by adding ‘and that is relevant to the functions of the transition team’ at the end.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that the government motion to strike out and replace clauses 16(a) and (d) of the bill be amended by striking out subclause (6)(d)(iii).”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

A government motion to clauses 16(a) and (d):

“I move that clauses 16(6)(a) and (d) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(a) require an old council or a local board of an old municipality to submit a report,

“(i) identifying the assets and liability of the old municipality or local board, or specified categories of those assets and liability, or

“(ii) naming the members and employees of the old municipality or local board and stating their positions, terms of employment, remuneration and benefits;

“(d) require an old council or a local board of an old municipality to,

“(i) furnish information, records or documents that are in its possession or control and are relevant to the functions of the transition team,

“(ii) create a new document or record that is relevant to the functions of the transition team by compiling existing information, and furnish the document or record, or

“(iii) submit a report concerning any matter the transition team specifies that is relevant to its functions.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

This is a government motion:

“I move that subsection 16(12) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Dissolution of transition team

“(12) The transition team is dissolved on January 31, 1998.”

Is it the wish of this House that the government motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

A Liberal motion:

“The Liberal members of the committee recommend the committee vote against section 17.” I am ruling this out of order.

A Liberal motion:

“I move that section 17 of the bill be struck out.” I’m ruling this out of order.

Shall section 17 carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

Section 18:

"The government recommends the members of the committee vote against section 18." I am ruling this out of order.

A Liberal motion:

"The Liberal members of the committee recommend the committee vote against section 18." I'm ruling this out of order.

A Liberal motion:

"I move that section 18 of the bill be struck out." I'm ruling this out of order.

2020

A Liberal motion, section 18:

"I move that section 18 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Application of JRPA and SPPA

"18. The Judicial Review Procedure Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act apply to the transition team."

Is it the wish of this committee that this Liberal motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"The Liberal members of the committee recommend that the committee vote against section 19."

I am ruling that out of order.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 19 of the bill be struck out."

I'm ruling that out of order.

Shall section 19 carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote is deferred.

"The government recommends that the members of the committee vote against section 20."

I am ruling this out of order.

A Liberal motion:

"I move that section 20 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Expenses

"20. Expenses of the transition team, including the remuneration expenses of its members, shall be paid by the government of Ontario."

I am ruling that out of order as it directs the expenditure of public funds.

Shall section 20 stand as printed? The section is lost.

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): On a point of order, Mr Chair: Could you please offer an explanation for what has just occurred, because I'm afraid I didn't understand what the issue was around section 20.

The Second Deputy Chair: I asked for a vote on section 20, if section 20 would carry, if it would stand as printed.

Mrs Boyd: Why you ruled it out of order.

Interjection: No, he didn't. It was the section before it.

Mrs Boyd: I see.

The Second Deputy Chair: Shall section 21 stand as part of the bill? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that section 22 of the bill be amended,

"(a) by striking out 'transitional year' in the third line of subsection (1) and substituting 'transitional period'; and

"(b) by striking out 'section 10 of the Municipal Elections Act' in the second and third lines of subsection (2) and substituting 'section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996'."

Is it the wish of this committee this government motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. The vote shall be deferred.

A Liberal motion:

"I move that section 22 of the bill be amended,

"(a) by striking out 'November 30, 1997,' in the second line of paragraph 1 and substituting 'November 30, 2000,'; and

"(b) by striking out 'section 10 of the Municipal Elections Act' in subsection (2) and substituting 'section 6 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996'."

Is it the wish of this committee this Liberal motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

This is a government motion, section 23, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4:

"I move that paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of section 23 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"1. The election shall be conducted as if sections 2, 3, 4 and 6 were already in force.

"2. The minister shall designate a person to conduct the 1997 regular election.

"4. The costs of the election that are payable in 1997 shall be included in the 1997 operating budget of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, and paid by that municipality as directed by the person designated under paragraph 2.

"4.1 Each area municipality under the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act shall include in its 1997 operating budget an amount equal to the amount it would have budgeted for the costs of the 1997 regular election had this act not been passed, and shall pay that amount to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto on or before July 1, 1997.

"4.2 The amount referred to in paragraph 4.1 shall be paid, first, from any reserve or reserve fund previously established by the area municipality for the costs of the 1997 regular election. For greater certainty, paragraph 3 of subsection 10(2) does not apply in respect of the payment."

Is it the wish of this committee this government motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote is deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 23 of the bill be amended,

"(a) by striking out '1997 regular election' in the first paragraph in the second line and in the third and fourth lines of paragraph 2 and substituting in both cases '2000 regular election'; and

"(b) by striking out '1997' in the second paragraph and last line of paragraph 4 and substituting in both cases '2000'; and

"(c) by striking out '1998' in paragraph 5 and substituting '2001'."

Is it the wish of this committee this Liberal motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

A NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out paragraphs 1, 2, and 4 of section 23 of the bill and substitute paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 4.1 and 4.2 be amended by striking out paragraphs 4, 4.1 and 4.2 and substituting the following:

"4. The costs of the election that are payable in 1997 shall be paid by the government of Ontario."

I am ruling this out of order because it is directing funds.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out paragraphs 1, 2, and 4" —

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I want to understand how in fact this motion is deemed to be out of order because, as you said, it directs the expenditure of funds, but the section within the bill in fact also does the same.

The Second Deputy Chair: Because it is directing expenditure of funds, it must be moved by a minister. Since that is unlikely for an NDP motion, I am ruling it out of order.

2030

Mr Silipo: I accept your ruling. I would just differ with the fact that it may be unlikely that a government minister may move it just because an NDP member has proposed it.

The Second Deputy Chair: It would have to be moved by a government minister.

Mr Silipo: Mr Chair, I was not quibbling or disagreeing with your ruling; I just wanted to understand it. All I was saying was that at the end of the ruling you said it was unlikely that a government minister would move it because it was an NDP amendment. I would just say you shouldn't assume that.

The Second Deputy Chair: It's 8:30 and that's good enough for me.

This is an NDP alternative motion:

"I move that the government motion to strike out paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of section 23 of the bill and substitute paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 4.1 and 4.2 be amended by striking out paragraphs 4, 4.1 and 4.2 and substituting the following:

"4. The costs of the election that are payable in 1998 shall be paid by the government of Ontario."

I am ruling that out of order.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that paragraph 5 of section 23 of the bill be struck out."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an independent motion:

"I move the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Election contributions, candidate for head of council
"23.1 Despite subsections 71(1) and (2) of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, the maximum total contribution a

contributor may make to a candidate for the office of mayor of the new city is \$2,500."

Is it the wish of this committee —

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): On a point of order, Mr Chair: Just to be clear here, you're saying this is an independent motion? The last time I checked, there is one member as an independent, Mr North, and the rest are parties. Can you tell us where that independent motion comes from? Is it from Mr North or is it from some other member of the assembly?

The Second Deputy Chair: This motion has been moved by the independent member, Mr North.

Mr Bisson: We wanted to make sure that if Mr North —

Interjections.

Mr Bisson: Very good, thank you.

The Second Deputy Chair: Is it the wish of this committee that this independent motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote is deferred.

Mr Bradley: This allows people to donate more money —

The Second Deputy Chair: Come to order. Will the member for St Catharines come to order, please.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move the government motion to amend the bill by adding [*failure of sound system*]."

This is a government motion:

"I move the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"Election contributions, candidate for head of council

"23.1 Despite subsections 71(1) and (2) of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, the maximum total contribution a contributor may make to a candidate for the office of mayor of the new city is \$1,500."

Is it the wish of this House that this government motion carry? I move this government motion lost.

Mr Bradley: Well, I'm in favour of it.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: You're too late.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that subsection 24(1) of the bill be amended by striking out clause (a)."

Is it the wish of this committee that the NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that subsection 24(1) of the bill be amended by striking out clause (b)."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is a government motion: clauses 24(1)(a) and (b):
"I move that subsection 24(1) of the bill be amended by striking out clauses (a) and (b) and substituting the following:

"(a) Exempt a local board from the application of any provisions of sections 9, 10 and 11."

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote is deferred.

This is a Liberal motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Regulations

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by regulation

"(a) deal with the transition members in connection with the 2000 regular election of the new city,

"(b) provide for any other transition matters as necessary or desirable for the effective implementation of this act."

Is it the wish of this committee that this Liberal motion carry? I declare it lost.

This is a government motion:

"I move that clause 24(1)(e) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(e) prescribe,

"(i) functions for the purpose of subsection 5.2(4) (additional functions, community councils),

"(ii) duties for the purpose of clause 9(4)(e) (financial advisory board),

"(iii) duties for the purpose of clause 16(4)(i) (transitional team), and

"(iv) anything else referred to in this act as being prescribed."

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? I declare this motion carried.

Mrs Boyd: I said no.

The Deputy Chair: I didn't hear you. I'm sorry.

All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote, then, is deferred.

Government motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Examples, transitional matters, 1997 regular election

"(1.1) Without limiting the generality of clause (1)(c), the minister may make regulations,

"(a) authorizing the use of voting and vote-counting equipment and of alternative voting methods, as described in section 42 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996;

"(b) establishing one or more dates for an advanced vote and opening hours of voting places on that date or dates, as described in section 43 of that act;

"(c) providing for the payment of rebates to persons who made contributions to candidates for office on city councils."

Is it the wish of this committee this government motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it. This vote is deferred.

2040

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that the government motion to amend section 24 of the bill by adding subsection (1.1) be amended by striking out clause (1.1)(c)."

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Mandatory regulations, contributing rebates

"(1.2) The minister shall, by regulation, provide for the payment of rebates to persons who made contributions to candidates for office on city council."

Is it the wish of this House that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is a government motion:

"I move that subsection 24(3) of the bill be struck out."

Is it the wish of this committee that this government motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the ayes have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbeywood Trail living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbeywood Trail living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry?

Hon Mr Leach: Mr Speaker, on a point of order.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to take a vote on it, but if it's on the vote —

Hon Mr Leach: It's on the vote.

The Second Deputy Chair: Your point of order?

Hon Mr Leach: I move that this is out of order. It's a money motion because it deals with telling members of the public where and how to obtain it without charge, meaning that there would be an effect on general revenue if this passed. So it's a money motion and I would move that it's out of order.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm ruling that it is in order, because although it may cost, it doesn't take funds from the general revenue fund.

Hon David Johnson: Mr Speaker, on another point of order: I understand there is a series of several thousand of

these motions and the only thing that has changed between them is that there's a different street.

Mr Laughren: It's important.

Hon David Johnson: You know, let's give our head a shake. I think the third party has put forward some 10,000 of these motions, word for word identical. In fact the only difference is that the street has changed in each one. According to standing order 23(m), I'm being advised here, if I can find 23(m) —

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for women's issues): Here it is, David.

Hon David Johnson: It relates to the introduction of "any matter in debate that in the option of the Speaker offends the practices and precedents of the House," number one; number two, I would refer to Erskine May and Beauchesne, "Any amendment brought forward in the spirit of mockery" and here we have some 10,000 of these word for word, except that every street in Metropolitan Toronto has been named in one of these. This is obviously in the spirit of mockery. The other word put forward by Beauchesne is "frivolous," I believe.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): "Trifling."

Hon David Johnson: "Trifling." Again, 10,000 of these, word for word the same, except that a different street has been substituted in every one. What's involved is a notice that could easily be applied in terms of one motion.

I would suggest to you, Mr Chair, that put forward in this fashion, this is put forward in a spirit of mockery or in a trifling fashion in the sense that there are 10,000 of them — 10,000 of them word for word except for the street being changed.

The Second Deputy Chair: Mr Johnson, on your point of order: I'm ruling that this motion is in order. I can't deal with any other ones except this one at this time and I'm ruling that this motion is in order.

Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel): Mr Chair, I'd like to challenge your ruling, with due respect, under rule 100(b).

The Second Deputy Chair: The member for Dufferin-Peel has appealed my ruling. We will await the Speaker to hear that appeal.

Interjections.

The committee recessed from 2049 to 2108.

The Second Deputy Chair: Mr Speaker, the committee is now reporting.

APPEAL OF CHAIR'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Speaker, Mr David Johnson has asked me to make a ruling that this NDP motion might be out of order. He is suggesting that it was frivolous and vexatious and trifling and that it made a mockery of the legislative process. I have ruled that this motion is in order and that we should proceed with it, and my ruling was challenged by Mr Tilson, the member for Dufferin-Peel. So this is being appealed to you. I'm sure you'll want to familiarize yourself with the information.

Mr Tilson: Mr Speaker, two proposals were put forward by the government House leader. The first one had to do with the fact that there have been filed over 8,000 similar amendments to the one that has been brought forward now.

Mr Bradley: You mean the one that has been tabled.

Mr Tilson: The one that has been tabled. I'm sorry.

Mr Bradley: Not rejected, but tabled.

Mr Tilson: Indeed. With respect to a specific amendment to subsection 24(4), the amendment which is put forward by the third party has to do with notice being given to residents of certain areas. The amendment is about a page long — I will not read it — and the only difference in these 8,000 amendments is the name of a street. I'll just read the first section.

"Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of" — in the case of the resolution that was read, it was Abbeywood Trail — "the residents of Abbeywood Trail living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:"

The first is, "The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbeywood Trail living in the urban area." Then it continues for five more sections.

Mr Speaker, the next 8,000 amendments that have been tabled are identical except for the name of a street, about 8,000 streets. Basically, as has been put forward by the government House leader, about 8,000 similar amendments are about to be read that propose the public consultations to be introduced to the regulations under this section of the act, which is section 24. The only difference between amendment 1 and amendment 8,000 is the name of a street. According to both Erskine May and Beauchesne, any amendment — and this is the authority I am relying on with respect to challenging the ruling of the Chair — brought forward in the spirit of mockery or found to be frivolous in substance is out of order.

My friends on the other side will say that putting forward 8,000 amendments simply changing the name of the street is not in the spirit of mockery or is certainly not frivolous. But Mr Speaker, it is that point that I would submit to you, that reading 8,000 amendments, which will last I don't know how long, simply naming off each individual street, all 8,000 of them, is clearly in my view mischievous and I would say it's frivolous to list off every one of those streets.

The Chair would duly respect as in order any amendment which sincerely attempted to bring about a purposeful and rational change to Bill 103, but I would ask, Mr Speaker, as has the government House leader, that you rule that the specific enumeration of over 8,000 amendments, each asking for Bill 103 to apply to a different street, was clearly tabled in the spirit of mockery and that all those amendments should therefore be ruled out of order.

That's the first reason for challenging the validity of this amendment, Mr Speaker. The second reason we're suggesting this is out of order is that in subsection 24(4), subparagraph ii of paragraph 5, it talks about the notice that's going to be given. It says — I don't know whether this is before you or not, Mr Speaker. I'm sure someone will make it available to you.

"The notice under paragraph 1 shall..." and then it says, "(ii) tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material," any member of the public listed on these 8,000 streets passed under section 24.

Requiring a copy of the act to be provided without charge directs the allocation of public funds. Money has to

come from somewhere. The members are saying, "Oh, oh." Money has to come from somewhere. Where is this money going to come from? It's going to come from public funds. As you are aware, Mr Speaker, pursuant to standing order 56, all amendments which would specifically direct the allocation of public funds shall be proposed only by a minister of the crown. Standing order 56 clearly states that.

There are all kinds of precedents of Chairs, of Speakers, ruling amendments out of order where they have violated standing order 56. I would refer you to a ruling of Deputy Chair Roberts of May 25, 1988. This is found at page 3,716 of the debates. In that matter, the Deputy Chair found that even though the allocation of public funds was already contemplated by the proposed bill, an opposition amendment which purported to dictate how much would be allocated to a specific purpose was out of order because it allocated public funds in contravention of the predecessor provision of standing order 56.

Interjections.

Mr Tilson: So it's ordered —

The Speaker: Point of order. They're allowed to put whatever they like in a point of order and if I'd like to hear it, you have an opportunity to put your own points of order.

Mr Tilson: Mr Speaker, when you're looking at that paragraph 5, I would ask you to note the word, "shall." "The notice under paragraph 1, shall tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with the background material." There's no choice. That money has to be spent. You have to provide this information without charge. It's got to come from somewhere. There's only one place it can come from.

So the word "shall" that I'm asking you to direct your attention to in this section — and this is of note because the same terminology is used in this amendment which requires that all copies of the act shall be provided at no cost, clearly allocating public funds to a particular purpose.

I'd also refer you to a decision of Speaker Treleaven of February 11, 1986, which is reported at page 4055 of the debates. In that circumstance, Speaker Treleaven found that an amendment was out of order where it would undoubtedly lead to the use of additional public funds. It's my submission that the amendment to this section, section 24, clearly allocates the spending of funds, the requirement that funds have to be spent, and indeed makes a commitment to the expenditure of funds that would not otherwise be committed but for this amendment.

It's therefore my respectful submission that this amendment and all of the following 7,999 amendments are companion amendments, because it's simply changing streets — that's the only difference, the names of streets — that they are all out of order, and it's submitted that an amendment is also out of order as it is substantially the same as an amendment to the same motion which has been already negated, Erskine May, 1989, at page 340.

In the absence of controlling authority, it clearly falls to consider the words "substantially the same" on their plain language meaning. Webster's defines "substantially" as "consisting of or relating to substance." I would suggest that in the same extent in form, in content.

Finally, I would direct your attention to both Beauchesne and Erskine May which state that an amendment will be out of order where it is equivalent to a negative of the bill or

reverses the principle of the bill as agreed to on the second reading.

2120

Interjections.

Mr Tilson: The intent of the bill, notwithstanding the shouting from the opposition, is to unify the city of Toronto. It is not to regulate regulatory balkanization on a street-by-street basis. Those are my submissions.

Mr Silipo: Speaker, I just want to make a couple of points in suggesting to you that this amendment is completely in order and that the ruling of the Chair should be upheld.

First of all, on the latter point that Mr Tilson made, I think you may want to clarify this with the table and with the Chair of the committee, but it's our understanding that was not the basis of the challenge, that the challenge was made on the argument that this was a frivolous amendment because there was an earlier point of order made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the basis of Mr Tilson's latter argument, that is, that this imposes a charge upon the treasury which the Chair ruled on and found that it was in order on that basis. The minister did not challenge the Chair, so there's a procedural aspect here, first of all, that I think you need to sort out.

Then the government House leader made the subsequent argument on a separate point of order, and he himself said that very clearly on a separate point of order to the Chair, that he was suggesting the amendment was out of order, not on the basis of Mr Tilson's arguments about the treasury and the impact on the treasury of this amendment, but indeed on the frivolous aspect of it. It was on that basis that the Chair again ruled this to be in order and it was on that basis that Mr Tilson challenged the ruling of the Chair.

I think that needs to be clear, Speaker. First of all, I am not sure how it is that a member whose ruling it was not was able to challenge the Chair, but if that's acceptable, that's fine. I'm not going to quibble with that. But it's very, very clear in my mind, and I would ask you to check this, as I say, with the table officers and with the Chair himself, that the challenge was only on the argument of whether it was frivolous or not.

I don't know whether I need to make arguments on the second point or not. I have some arguments that I want to make to you on the frivolous aspect. Do you want me to just proceed and put the arguments on both?

The Speaker: Yes, I think you might as well proceed. I'll deal with it as a package.

Mr Silipo: Then to continue on that, just in the event that you do entertain the argument on the second point, the challenge on the second point on the question of whether this in fact imposes a charge, I would say to you that the test has to be: Does this amendment impose a charge upon the public treasury? Again, the test, as I understand it in Beauchesne, is that would only be the case if it extends the objects and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications as expressed in the royal recommendation.

Here this, first of all, is not in our view a charge upon the public treasury. There is simply an indication that the notice that's required here should tell people how they can obtain that without charge, a copy of the act together with background material. It's a way to give them information. It's not a way to establish a charge. Any charges have to do with the municipality, not with the province.

Last, I would say on this point, even though this is not an issue that's before you properly because the Chair was not challenged on this point, even if you were to find that that particular subsection is somehow out of order, that in and of itself does not render the rest of the amendment out of order. You could simply strike out, and you would have to, the offending subsection, and the rest of it would still be able to stand on its own.

I'm going to come back to the essential point that that issue isn't even before you and shouldn't be before you, because the Chair wasn't challenged on that point.

To come back to the challenge that this is a frivolous amendment: It may be that government members think that having a series of amendments that suggest that before the minister makes regulations, the residents who live on various streets in the municipalities should be advised — to them that may be frivolous or vexatious or mocking, but in our view they are very serious and they presented in a very serious light. It is providing for people to be advised before particular actions are taken. Those actions, I remind you, would still be taken in the furtherance of the object of the act.

As you yourself ruled earlier, the objective of the act here is the amalgamation of the various municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto. This amendment, and these amendments to follow — again I say to you we have this amendment in front of us, not the amendments that follow — does not mean to alter the objective of the legislation. For you to find that this amendment is frivolous, you would have to find that it attempts to alter the objective of the legislation, and it does not do that.

I refer you briefly to one indication, one precedent where in the House of Commons on June 14, 1965, the then Chairman of the committee did find — just as one example — something that constituted an action to be frivolous, and that was an attempt to change the name of the bill to something that had nothing to do with the intent of the bill. Again, the Chair at the time, in applying that ruling, said, "I do not think there is any justification, because it does not carry out the intent of the bill" — the amendment being, in that case, the change of the name of the bill.

The amendment does nothing to alter the intent of the bill. The intent of the bill, and I know you dealt with this with great care earlier on when we challenged the amendments the government proposed — you found at the end of the day that our challenge was unwarranted because the amendments submitted by the government did not change the intent of the legislation, which was and remains the amalgamation of six municipalities into one. Our amendment likewise does not change the intent of the legislation. It simply sets in place, if accepted, a series of actions that would have to be taken by the minister, but to do that in a way that still respects and reflects the intent of the legislation. I think that has to be the ultimate test at the end of the day in terms of whether you find this to be in order.

In concluding, I say again that what you have in front of you is the challenge not on 8,000 amendments but a challenge on this one amendment, and your ruling has to be on this one amendment.

2130

Ms Castrilli: By the rules of parliamentary process you're bound by three things in priority: standing orders, legislative precedent and the authorities. The motion before

us seeks to strike out this amendment on the basis of the authorities — not on the basis of standing orders, not on the basis of legislative precedent. I submit to you that there is nothing in our rules which says that this motion is out of order.

The member for Dufferin-Peel's attempt to characterize this as falling within standing order 56 is simply a vain attempt, because it was not part of the original motion which you were asked to rule upon.

The legislative precedents again are silent on the motion that's before you. The only precedent that in fact has been found is one that comes from the Ontario Legislature, June 14, 1965, and in that case it was a motion to change the Medical Services Insurance Act to be called the Medical Carriers Benefit Act, a totally different concept, and the Speaker, in that case, rightly determined that the amendment was out of order because it changed the nature of the bill. That's not again the case before us. This amendment is very much in keeping with the stated purpose of the act.

That brings us to the authorities. Beauchesne has been quoted, and I'd like to take a little bit of time to talk about Beauchesne. Subsection 773(3) says, "An amendment is out of order if it is offered at the wrong place in the bill" — which is not this case — "if it is tendered to the committee in a spirit of mockery or if it is vague or trifling."

Now is this amendment to be considered as tendered to the committee or to this House in the spirit of mockery? I suggest to you, Speaker, that is not the case, that the members of this Legislature who have brought forward this amendment have done it in absolute earnest because they believe that the amendment is in the best interests of the people of the city of Toronto. It has been brought with all good intentions to try and have the democratic process prevail.

We'll remember that a series of referendums have in fact given the government a very clear indication that the people of Toronto environs do not want this type of legislation and the amendment is brought forward in a spirit of trying to respond to the very real concerns of people. They're worried about the fact that their neighbourhoods and the character of their neighbourhoods would be lost.

May I also say that to suggest or to try to impute the motives of any individual members or collective members in this House diminishes this assembly and therefore it does not fall under that particular section.

Is this amendment vague? I submit to you that it is not. It couldn't be more specific. It's probably one of the most specific amendments that we've had so far. That leaves us with "trifling." Again, it is not trifling when you consider that the people of Toronto and the other municipalities have said very clearly that they want their neighbourhoods preserved, they want their communities preserved and it is in that spirit that these amendments are brought forward.

In the absence of standing orders, in the absence of legislative precedents and, quite frankly, in the absence of the conditions necessary for you to observe the authorities, this motion is totally out of order.

The Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): He has to be in his seat.

The Speaker: The member for Fort William.

Mrs McLeod: As the member for Downsview has just said, our standing orders are very clear that in committee of the whole any amendment may be placed providing it is relevant to the bill that is before the House. Certainly the amendments that are before us are relevant to the bill before the House.

But what I would like to speak very briefly to is the issue of whether or not an amendment or a motion could be ruled out of order on the basis, as Beauchesne has said, of it being tendered in a spirit of mockery. Clearly, if this House is to begin to consider, and you, Mr Speaker, are being asked to consider, ruling amendments out of order on the basis that they've been tendered in a spirit of mockery, it requires a definition of "mockery" and what constitutes mockery.

With that in mind, I would like to take as precedent for your consideration your own ruling of a few hours ago when one of the substantive government amendments was challenged as not being in order. That was the amendment on section 5 of the bill being struck out and a considerable substitution being made, which is, as you know, and I'm not going to waste time by reading it, but it had to do with the establishment of the six community councils and was supposedly tendered in response to public concern about the loss of their community council and their community decision-making, their community involvement.

You were challenged that it was out of order because it was in fact a negative of the bill itself. It changed the bill. It was substantively a new bill. Your ruling looked at the amendment and, as I understood your ruling, said that although one part of the amendment says that, "There shall be six community councils," a further part of that same amendment said that, "The city council may dissolve...a community council." If I again remember correctly, your ruling said that dissolution could take place within an hour of the establishment of the community councils.

I would, first of all, suggest that if, as a member has argued, you can rule out of order something which is a negative of the intention of a bill, it would have been possible to have ruled out of order something which was a negative of the intention of the amendment within the amendment itself, and clearly dissolving a community council which in the previous clause has been established mandatorily under the legislation is a negative of the intention of the amendment itself.

I'm not arguing your previous rule. I'm holding it up as precedent. I think that if anything has been tendered in a spirit of mockery today, it is the government's substantive amendment, significantly changing a bill supposedly in response to public concern and presenting that amendment in such a way that the act it is taking, establishing with the word "shall establish six community councils" and a few clauses later saying that those same community councils established by law can be dissolved within the hour is as great a mockery of legislation presented in this House as anything could be.

I respect the ruling you made earlier. I think you felt it was relevant to the bill. Our standing orders say anything which is relevant to the bill is an amendment in good order. I therefore accepted your ruling and would ask that you take it as precedent in subsequent rulings this evening.

The Speaker: Member for Scarborough East.

Mr Gilchrist: My apologies, I hadn't moved after we returned out of committee of the whole House.

I won't seek to repeat the legal arguments that were made very well by my colleague from Dufferin-Peel, but I would like to emphasize the aspect of Erskine May that directs you to take exception to this amendment and the subsequent amendments under the heading of making a mockery of this chamber.

The members opposite have been prone in these last few minutes, and while we awaited your return, to cite the fact that a previous leader of the third party had one day read into the record the names of the lakes and streams of Ontario. They responded by changing standing orders as they related to those procedures in the House. I merely make this one —

The Speaker: I don't know how this is germane to the debate. I'm seeking that.

Mr Gilchrist: In the context of making those changes, they themselves made reference to the fact, to those same references in Erskine May about how trifling it was, how frivolous it was, how dilatory a tactic it was, and their own words come back today to haunt them.

Clearly, if their inference is that only the residents of one street deserve a certain treatment, that in and of itself is offensive and trifling because as they know full well, it is quite possible in this chamber for one amendment to pass or some amendments to pass and others to fail.

Surely the intent of their motion, if they really believe in the rest of that clause, is that everyone in the city of Toronto deserves that equal treatment. I'm sure our side would grant unanimous consent if they chose to amend the first of their amendments to read that all residents of the city of Toronto be treated the same way so that there is not this haphazard and very discriminatory treatment of the various residents in the various parts of Toronto. It is frivolous in the extreme, and I hope you see favour in those arguments.

Mr Wildman: Point of order, Mr Speaker: With respect, the member has just made a frivolous argument.

The government House leader initially stated in presentation to the Chair of the committee of the whole House and he cited rule 23(m) and argued that this offended 23(m), which states that it's out of order if a member "Introduces any matter in debate that in the opinion of the Speaker offends the practices and precedents of the House." Therefore, it is incumbent upon the people making the argument to indicate how the amendment offends the practices and precedents of the House, and obviously the Chair of the committee of the whole House did not see any way that this amendment offends the practices and precedents. It certainly cannot offend the practices of the House in the sense that is in some way negating the bill; it doesn't negate the bill. So that's not a matter of significance.

2140

Then the question arises whether or not it is indeed a mockery or frivolous, and that is a matter you have to rule upon. The argument that an individual street name being listed makes it a mockery or frivolous I don't understand. The intent of the amendment is to say that the people in a particular location in this city are to be informed about how they can get a copy. It that is somehow to be viewed as frivolous or a mockery, then I don't understand how on

earth it can be suggested that this is an attempt to make a mockery of this House. Frankly, that argument itself is a mockery. Surely we are in favour of ensuring that people get information. That's what the amendment is about.

If the government doesn't want them to get the information, all they have to do is vote against the amendment; that's all they have to do. We believe they should get the information. If the government doesn't want them to, then just vote down the amendment; that's all you have to do. To suggest that somehow this relates to a number of other amendments because of different street names — we've only got one amendment here and we're only dealing with one amendment; that is all. There have been no other amendments put as yet. There will be.

The member for Scarborough East suggested that perhaps the government would be interested in putting an amendment which deals with all of them. Well, if the government wants such an amendment, then put it.

Mr Gilchrist: It's your amendment. I said we'd —

Mr Wildman: No, no. If the government wants to vote for such an amendment, then the government should put it. But if he doesn't really want it, then he indeed is being frivolous and making a mockery of the process.

Mr Tilson: Mr Speaker, I'm not going to repeat what I said other than to comment on two remarks that were made by the member for Downsview and the member for Fort William. The member for Downsview I believe talked about specific directions. The member for Fort William talked about how the standing orders must be very clear, must be specifically clear. I'm going to read you the section of standing order 56, Mr Speaker. I'm sure you know it, but I'm going to ask that you read with me.

Mr Wildman: In case he gets lost.

Mr Tilson: No, I have more respect for the Speaker than that.

"Any bill, resolution, motion or address, the passage of which would impose a tax or specifically direct the allocation of public funds, shall not be passed by the House unless recommended by a message from the Lieutenant Governor, and shall be proposed only by a minister of the crown."

This specific amendment that's before us now and the subsequent 7,999 amendments have been proposed by a member of the New Democratic Party. This standing order is very clear. Money must be spent to enforce this amendment. I don't know where the money is going to come from. It's not going to come from the trees; it's got to come from the government. There's only one person who can do that, and that is a minister of the crown, and the person from the New Democratic Party who made that proposal is not a minister of the crown, Mr Speaker, and that is the issue I would like you to emphasize.

The Speaker: I really appreciate all the input. I think I have the gist of each party's arguments.

Hon David Johnson: Mr Speaker, to be succinct —

The Speaker: I'm not going to tell you you can't have a point of order; you can. If you want to be succinct, if there's new information, I'll be very happy to hear it.

Hon David Johnson: Just to fortify the member for Dufferin-Peel, I'm informed that if a member of the public inquires about a copy of the act, as is referred to in the motion that's before us that we're questioning in terms of

whether it's in order, that member of the public would be referred to the bookstore at the present time, where there would be a charge. I think that substantiates the member's point that this a money item and should be brought forward by a minister of the crown.

Ms Lankin: Mr Speaker, I respect your desire for us to be brief, and I will be. This government has plenty of experience of posting information and background papers with respect to the megacity legislation on the Internet. That is all they would need to do and it does not call for any expenditure of moneys, and obviously, given that it says "without charge," it does not impose a tax.

Mr Bradley: The point I would make is that it's a very valid point by the member for Beaches-Woodbine: It is available on the Internet. These people here, remember, have made a change, Mr Speaker. Now if you want to get, for instance, the Hansard of the Legislature, you can no longer get it as an individual person unless it's on the Internet. That was something promoted by this government, and of course it would be free of charge to the person.

But what I want to say to you, Mr Speaker, very briefly is that this particular argument, section 56, has nothing to do with the challenge made to the Chair. Nobody mentioned that at all. This came in later on when somebody, Mac Penney or somebody else, advised the member that he should bring this up. That's very good for Mr Penney to do that — he has earned his money this evening — but it has nothing to do with the challenge made to the Chair.

Mr Wildman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I should say to the Liberal House leader that on that particular matter the issue was not raised with the Chair of the committee of the whole House and therefore it is completely irrelevant.

Mrs McLeod: I think the member for Dufferin-Peel may have realized that the government House leader did not challenge this particular amendment being in order under that particular section of the standing orders and that in attempting to stretch that part of the standing orders to apply to this motion he's suggesting that it might involve some expenditure of moneys. Mr Speaker, I don't suspect there is a single amendment that could be brought forward by the opposition on any bill that would not, if implemented, require some expenditure in implementation. I have a number of amendments, all of which have been considered to be in order in committee, that would, for example, change the date of the election from 1997 to 2000. I'm sure in some way that might involve some lost revenue supposedly to be saved. But if we're to be challenged that we can't bring forward an amendment if it involves any kind of expenditure of any sort, then the opposition would have to pack their bags and go home.

The Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate the input and I think I'd like to take 10 minutes or so and review the important points you've made.

The House recessed from 2148 to 2203.

The Speaker: I'd like to thank the members for bringing their particular points of order to me. Let me deal with the frivolous and vexatious motion to begin with, or point of order.

First off, I'm looking at one amendment. I don't see obviously the 8,000 that follow or that number about. Having said that, frivolous and vexatious motions would be

ones on the face of them that appear to be that way. It has to be obvious I think not only to the Speaker but to anyone reading the amendment that it is in fact moved in a frivolous and vexatious manner. I don't see these as being frivolous and vexatious. I see them as being motions put by honourable members, honourable.

Having said that, I'll move now to the second point of order. Let me be clear from the outset. That was not a point of order, as I understand it, that was raised during the challenge of the Chair. Therefore, it is not properly before me at this time. But in the interests of time, rather than I would imagine going back and making the arguments once again, I would be prepared to rule on it now.

I tend to agree with the member for Fort William's points of view which were made at the time of her point of order, which were practically every amendment has a cost attached to it, and that cost has to be very direct if it's going to be ruled out of order on a cost basis. In essence, it has to direct dollars and cents in a very appropriate, specific manner. Simply printing an amendment and asking that it be part of the bill, one could argue is a cost, because the bill grows longer and in fact it costs more to print, more to distribute etc. I don't see that cost as being a direct and related cost that the amendment is asking for, nor would I expect it to be an amendment that only could be approved by a minister.

I appreciate your point of order. It was well-thought-out, well put, but I find no grounds to support it.

House in committee of the whole.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996 LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO (continued)

The First Deputy Chair (Ms Marilyn Churley): Order. Shall the NDP motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion will be deferred.

The following motion is an NDP motion.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbotsfield Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbotsfield Gate living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

""4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

""5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

""i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

""ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

""iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

""iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

2210

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbotsford Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbotsford Road living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

""4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

""5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

""i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

""ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

""iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

""iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbott Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbott Avenue living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion shall be deferred.

Mr Wildman: Thank you.

The First Deputy Chair: You’re welcome.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbottswood Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbottswood Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say “aye.” Those opposed, please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbs Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbs Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say “aye.” All those opposed, please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abell Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abell Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say “aye.” Those opposed, please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

2220

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aberdeen Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aberdeen Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aberfoyle Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aberfoyle Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aberlady Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aberlady Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abigail Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abigail Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abilene Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abilene Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abinger Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abinger Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion the ayes have it. The vote will be deferred.

2230

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albemarle Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albemarle Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abner Place living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abner Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abrams Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abrams Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acacia Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acacia Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acacia Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acacia Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

2240

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4): "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Academy Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Academy Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acheson Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acheson Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ackrow Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ackrow Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acland Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acland Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acme Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acme Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acorn Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acorn Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.”

Interjections.

2250

The First Deputy Chair: Could I have some order, please? Order, please. Thank you.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acre Heights Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acre Heights Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4) —

Interjection: Dispense.

The First Deputy Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acton Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acton Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ada Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ada Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adair Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adair Road living in the urban area."

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adamede Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adamede Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

2300

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adams Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adams Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adams Park Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adams Park Gate living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adanac Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adanac Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Addington Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Addington Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

z Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Addington Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Addington Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Addington Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Addington Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

2310

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adelaide Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adelaide Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

The Chair: The motion brought in by the NDP:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adele Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adele Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adeline Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adeline Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adelpha Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adelpha Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): On a point of order, Mr Chair: If I may, and perhaps by way of a query to the Chair, here we are at 11:20 at night. Is it indeed true that members of the public are invited to come here to Queen's Park this evening and tomorrow morning to witness this unique exercise in democracy? Is that true, Chair, that right here at Queen's Park tonight at 11:20 the public can attend in the galleries?

The Chair: Thank you very much. This is not a point of order.

We have another NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adencliff Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adencliff Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

2320

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aderno Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aderno Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adesso Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adesso Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adirondack Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adirondack Gate living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Another NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adler Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adler Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Admiral Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Admiral Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

2330

Here's another NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adonis Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adonis Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it once more. Deferred vote.

A new motion by the NDP.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adra Villaway living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adra Villaway living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. A deferred vote.

An NDP motion.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adrian Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adrian Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Adriatic Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Adriatic Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

Another interesting motion from the NDP:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Advance Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Advance Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

2340

The next one is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Afton Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Afton Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Agar Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Agar Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Agate Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Agate Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Agatha Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Agatha Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Agincourt Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Agincourt Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ahmic Lake Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ahmic Lake Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

2350

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aikenhead Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aikenhead Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aileen Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aileen Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ailsa Craig Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ailsa Craig Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ainsdale Road living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ainsdale Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ainsley Gardens living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ainsley Gardens living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

2400

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ainsworth Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ainsworth Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aintree Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aintree Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a

public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Interjections: No.

The Chair: I just wanted to see if you were awake. Nice to see some life in the House.

In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Airdrie Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Airdrie living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Report continues in volume C.

CONTENTS

Wednesday April 2 1997

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE City of Toronto Act, 1996,

Bill 103, *Mr Leach*

Mr Leach	7545
Mr Silipo	7545
Mr Colle	7545
Mrs McLeod	7545
The Chair	7546
Mr Hampton	7546
Mr Bradley	7547
Mr David Johnson	7547
Ms Castrilli	7547
Mr Wildman	7548
Ms Lankin	7548
Ms Churley	7553
Mr Sergio	7553
Mr Gerretsen	7555
The Second Deputy Chair	7557
Mr Crozier	7563
Mrs Boyd	7565
Mr Bisson	7566
Mr Tilson	7568
The First Deputy Chair	7573
Mr Kormos	7583

OTHER BUSINESS

Appeal of Chair's ruling

Ms Lankin	7548, 7572
Mr Silipo	7548, 7569
Mr Colle	7548
Mr Leach	7549
Mr Bradley	7549, 7572
Mr Wildman	7549, 7571
Ms Castrilli	7550, 7570
Mr David Johnson	7550, 7572
Mr Cordiano	7550
Mrs McLeod	7550, 7570
Mr Kwinter	7550
The Speaker	7551, 7572
The Second Deputy Chair	7568
Mr Tilson	7568
Mr Gilchrist	7571

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 2 avril 1997

COMITÉ PLÉNIER DE
L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
Loi de 1996 sur la cité de Toronto,
projet de loi 103, *M. Leach*

CA 2 ON

XI

-023



No. 176C

N° 176C

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Thursday 3 April 1997

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 3 April 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

Report continued from volume B.

0005

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO

Continuing consideration of Bill 103, An Act to replace the seven existing municipal governments of Metropolitan Toronto by incorporating a new municipality to be known as the City of Toronto / *Projet de loi 103, Loi visant à remplacer les sept administrations municipales existantes de la communauté urbaine de Toronto en constituant une nouvelle municipalité appelée la cité de Toronto.*

The Chair (Mr Gilles E. Morin): A new NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Airley Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Airley Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aitken Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aitken Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

There is an amendment that comes from the third party.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Acacia Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Acacia Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. When it is a recorded vote I would ask that the members be at their seat. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Akron Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Akron Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alabaster Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alabaster Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alameda Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alameda Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alamosa Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alamosa Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

0020

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Abbeville Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Abbeville Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alan Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alan Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alanbull Square living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alanbull Square living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alanbury Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation — ”

There should be no exchange between the gallery and the members.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): My fault.

The Chair: I'm sorry, but I may have to repeat that same motion. Is it okay?

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alanbury Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alanbury Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” Those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alanmeade Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alanmeade Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0030

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alba Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alba Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albacore Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albacore Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albani Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albani Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

The Acting Chair (Mrs Margaret Marland): NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albany Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albany Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albemarle Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albermarle Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.’”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0040

Subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albert Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albert Avenue living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.’”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albert Franck Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albert Franck Place living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulations,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.’”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour say “aye.” All opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion deferred.

Subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alberta Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alberta Avenue living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulations,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.’”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour please say “aye.” All opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Motion deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albertus Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albertus Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. The motion is deferred, only just.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albion Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albion Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." All opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. Motion deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albion Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albion Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour please say "aye." All opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. Motion deferred.

0050

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Albright Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Albright Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. Motion deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alcan Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alcan Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. Motion deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alcester Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alcester Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour please say "aye." All opposed please say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. The motion is deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4): It is moved that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alcina Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alcina Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour please say "aye." All opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Bert Johnson): This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alcorn Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alcorn Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldburn Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldburn Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldbury Gardens living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldbury Gardens living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

0100

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alden Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alden Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldenham Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldenham Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alder Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alder Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alder Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alder Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion is deferred.

A further NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alderbrae Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alderbrae Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion is deferred.

A further NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alderbrook Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alderbrook Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldercrest Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldercrest Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry? All in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

0110

An NDP motion.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alderdale Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alderdale Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

An NDP motion.

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldergrove Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldergrove Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this House that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion.

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldershot Crescent Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldershot Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

An NDP motion.

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alderton Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alderton Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this House this NDP motion carry? All those in favour of the motion say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldgate Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldgate Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this House that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." Those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldridge Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation" —

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-Woodbine): I appreciate that you are attempting to expedite, and that is fine, Mr Chair, but with the noise in the chamber, I actually cannot follow you. I'm attempting to hear which amendment you're on and follow with the amendments. I would just ask that either order be brought in the chamber or that you raise your voice a bit.

The Second Deputy Chair: I will try to accommodate you. I don't think that I can talk any louder, and we may have to have more quietness. But do you have a copy of this in front of you?

Ms Lankin: I believe I do. I would just like you to refer again, "Despite subsection (1)."

The Second Deputy Chair: Which avenue are you on?

Ms Lankin: Aldridge Avenue.

The Second Deputy Chair: Where would you like me to start again, please?

Ms Lankin: That's fine. You can continue on. I just wanted to make sure I was on the right one.

The Second Deputy Chair: "1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldridge Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this House that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

0120

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aldwych Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aldwych Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this House that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexander Street" —

Mr Gilchrist: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: As you will increasingly discover as we go through these — we've done a bit of research — we've only done perhaps 10% and have identified amendments which are grossly in error, grossly in violation of both the principle of the bill and Erskine May and Beauchesne. For example, the amendment that's before us right now is absolutely inappropriate, given that it's completely vague. There are two Alexander Streets within the new urban area as defined in the City of Toronto Act. Obviously, I would not want to impugn the research and the production of these amendments that have been done by the third party, but we can draw no other conclusion than that they are being selective and only one of those Alexander Streets will receive the notice of the regulations that they themselves are suggesting are critically important, important enough to occupy all this time in this chamber.

Given that both Beauchesne and Erskine May make it very clear you cannot have an amendment which is vague and there is no reference in this amendment to which Alexander Street — there is one in Etobicoke and one in Toronto — I suggest that unless they are comfortable with the idea that they are discriminating against certain residents of this new city, or in the alternative, admitting that they were so sloppy in preparing their amendments that they did not take the time to identify obvious duplications, and again, you will see hundreds of them as we go through, the bottom line, Mr Speaker, is you must rule that this amendment is out of order. It does not specify which Alexander Street is the point of the amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: If you will give me a minute to consider that point of order. I'll take a minute to consider that point of order.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): If I could speak to the point of order that's been raised, and perhaps it would expedite the process, since I think we're probably all weary at 25 after 1. I'm sure, since the government is enthusiastic and wanting to make sure that there is a high degree of specificity, and I would concur with the parliamentary assistant, who has done the research, and I would concur that he would not want to impugn the research that has been done by the third party, and I'm sure the members of the third party want to be as specific as possible in their amendments so that due justice can be done to the residents of each of the Streets named Alexander, and therefore, I'm sure it would expedite matters and I would ask that the third party consider a friendly amendment from the government to your amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: One from each party, so I recognize the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Ms Lankin: First of all, let me deal with the point of order that has been raised, and I would suggest to you that the government — I know it's late and I know they would desperately like to move beyond dealing with the very many serious amendments that have been brought forward, but I think they're stretching at this point in time. If I may point out to you, first of all, just in terms of Beauchesne, if you refer to page 175 and to section 570, you will see that it rules very clearly on admissible amendments, "An amendment cannot be ruled out because of its vagueness." I would argue, however, that this doesn't even apply in the

case that is before us, because there is no vagueness. If in fact the government members feel that it is important that there be references to additional streets that we have not included, then that would have been within their power to have submitted amendments for those streets.

The individual amendment that's before you deals with Alexander Street, and whether or not the government wants to add more streets, unfortunately, the time for filing amendments has passed and they are no longer able to file those amendments.

We have filed amendments. Our amendment is very clear. It's very specific in the way in which it has been stated, and I believe that you must look at the amendment on the face of it. The very important thing to remember is that in all of these, the key being is it relevant to the section, and I could spend some time going through why it's relevant, but I think that the member's objection based simply on vagueness has not been proven at this point in time.

The last argument I would make is that if the member believes that in fact there is some unfairness to this particular amendment that has been put forward, then certainly the members of the government are entitled, based on that, to vote against it. I suspect that they might want to vote in favour of this one, and they're unfortunately feeling that because they think that it may exclude some people on another street, it's unfair. That's a question of a value judgement with respect to whether or not they are in support of an amendment. It is not a question of whether or not the amendment of itself, on the face of it, is vague.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm only going to consider one argument from each party on this point of order, so if you'll please take your seat. I want to know to the best of your information, is every street in the six cities covered in these motions?

Ms Lankin: I can provide you with information on how our list was compiled. It was compiled being cross-checked from an electronic database which contains all the streets within Metropolitan Toronto, as well as a map of Metro Toronto, which is produced by a company called Metro Art, and there is a cross-referencing of these two sources.

I would not assert that absolutely every street in Toronto or in Metropolitan Toronto is in fact included, and it's not necessary for it to be included. These are the amendments that we have brought forward. They affect the streets that we have in fact set out here, and each street stands on its own.

0130

The Second Deputy Chair: It's some information I wanted, and that's why I asked the question. I will be taking a minute to make my ruling.

I'm addressing my ruling to the member for Scarborough East, and I'm ruling this way, that this motion applies to Alexander Street and therefore it applies to all Alexander streets in the new city, and so it won't matter if there is one, two or a dozen, it will apply to them all. Therefore, it is not a point of order.

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexandra Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexandra Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall stand deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexandra Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexandra Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexandra Wood living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexandra Wood living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexdon Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexdon Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of the committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall stand deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexis Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexis Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, please say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alexmuir Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alexmuir Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alford Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alford Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alfred Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alfred Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0140

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Algie Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Algie Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Algo Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Algo Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Algoma Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Algoma Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Algonquin Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Algonquin Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Algonquin Island living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Algonquin Island living in the urban area.”

Ms Lankin: Point of order, Mr Chair: I was just trying to follow which one you’re on. We would like to withdraw this amendment.

The Second Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alhambra Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alhambra Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alhart Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alhart Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0150

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alice Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alice Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alicewood Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alicewood Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alissa Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alissa Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alladin Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alladin Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allan Park Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allan Park Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allanbrooke Drive living in the

urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allanbrooke Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allanford Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allanford Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say

"nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allangrove Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allangrove Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0200

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allanhurst Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allanhurst Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allcroft Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allcroft Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allen Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allen Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allenbury Gardens living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allenbury Gardens living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allenby Avenue living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allenby Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allenvale Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allenvale Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed,

say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allenwood Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allenwood Crescent living in the urban area."

Ms Lankin: Mr Chair, could you repeat the name of that street, please?

The Second Deputy Chair: It's not a street; it's a crescent. It's Allenwood Crescent.

Ms Lankin: Allenwood? Thank you.

The Second Deputy Chair: "2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allerton Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allerton Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0210

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alliance Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alliance Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allingham Gdns living in the urban area shall be made" — Excuse me. I want to ask a question.

Ms Lankin: It's a short form of Gardens.

The Second Deputy Chair: Well, it is my opinion that a short form would have a period after it; otherwise a

person doesn't know whether or not it's a short form. I have sought another opinion on it. I'll be reading it the way it is spelled.

With respect to the residents of Allingham Gardens, this reads: "the residents of Allingham Gdns living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allingham Gdns living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allison Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allison Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allister Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allister Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0220

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allonsius Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allonsius Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alloy Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alloy Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allstate Pkwy" —

Mr Gilchrist: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I know that the member for Beaches-Woodbine has been following along dutifully. I wonder if she could explain what part of Toronto Allstate Parkway is in, because checking of Perly's

indicates that the only Allstate Parkway is actually in Mississauga. I would refer back to the definition in the introduction of this act which defines the "urban area" as the territory formerly comprised of the six cities within the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Obviously, this amendment is outside the scope of the bill. It is not within Metropolitan Toronto.

But it is more than that: It once again highlights the degree of frivolousness and the absolute lack of attention to detail that the third party has put into these amendments. We've already dealt with the issue of duplicate streets and you made your ruling. While I certainly understand the conclusion you reached I think there are some more glaring ones come up.

But, Mr Chairman, the Speaker, in his ruling on the first amendment, indicated that it was in fact only the first amendment and he was constrained, quite appropriately, that he couldn't look down the road, he didn't have a crystal ball. But these are the duplicates; these are the streets that don't exist; these are references, in some cases, to not even streets, to cities which aren't within Metropolitan Toronto.

We already have the member for Beaches-Woodbine having put on the record that she is not prepared to make an absolute statement that every street within Metropolitan Toronto is listed. She has admitted that they are discriminating and that only certain streets within Metro Toronto deserve to be treated a certain way, which comes right back to one of the arguments I made with the Speaker in that first amendment, that you cannot, that we cannot consider amendments which deal with in different ways with different people in the city. We cannot do that.

So not only is it vague in the case of the duplicate streets, not only is it frivolous and against the spirit of the bill which is in fact designed to bring together the disparate parts of Metropolitan Toronto, these amendments choose instead to balkanize all of Toronto and in fact to divide it into 8,000 different parts.

I can tell you categorically there are streets within Metropolitan Toronto that are not the subject of the amendments that have been tabled by the NDP. They have done that shoddy research, although I find it interesting that they privatized it. They went to an outside company. They didn't have their own staff do the research. They outsourced it indeed.

And let me draw a few other things to your attention, Mr Chair.

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order.

Mr Gilchrist: With the greatest of respect —

The Second Deputy Chair: These are on the same point of order?

Mr Gilchrist: Absolutely.

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): We'd like to know what the point is.

Mr Gilchrist: Well, start listening then perhaps, leader of the third party. It's outside the scope of the bill.

I would also draw your attention, with the greatest respect, to the member for Beaches-Woodbine, her earlier reference to Beauchesne is totally inapplicable. She quoted from a page that has to do with motions. That's not what we're doing here today. These are amendments to a bill and

section 698, page 207, and I quote: "An amendment is out of order if it is offered at the wrong place in the bill, if it is tendered to the committee in a spirit of mockery or if it is vague or trifling."

I don't know whether that would cause you to reconsider your earlier ruling, but I would have to ask you in this case, given the fact that we are now seeing an incredible pattern of inattention to detail, discrimination, absolute abuse of process, a trifling with the very essence of what this Legislature is all about, and in fact the inclusion of streets and other geographical features which aren't even within Metropolitan Toronto, you really can have no choice, Mr Chairman, in this case. It is not in Metropolitan Toronto, Allstate Parkway, and it is merely the first of hundreds and hundreds of similar errors in the drafting of these amendments.

These are time-wasting, dilatory tactics which are absolutely unbecoming the third party or any member in this chamber. They are a contradiction to the authorities of Erskine May, they are trifling, they are vague, they are contrary to the authorities of Beauchesne which have similar directions to you in the chair.

I would argue that this amendment and all subsequent amendments be deemed to be out of order for the reasons which I have cited.

The Second Deputy Chair: I would like to hear from each of the parties. I'll take you in rotation. The Chair recognizes the member for York South.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (York South): I just want to refer to standing order 23 that states: "In debate, a member shall be called to order by the Speaker if he or she:

"(a) Speaks twice to a question...."

We have heard repetitious argument here made by the member opposite and, Mr Chair, I think you recognize in what has been said that this is exactly the same argument, with due respect and deference to the Chair, which was made earlier —

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order.

Mr Gilchrist: It's a different question.

Mr Kennedy: — on a number of occasions. We ask you to rule in that way.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to address the government members. I want to hear.

The Chair recognizes the member for Beaches-Woodbine on this same point of order.

Ms Lankin: Yes, on the same point of order. The member for Scarborough East makes reference to Beauchesne and makes reference to admissibility of amendments in committee and in doing so, seeks to argue that the amendment before us is either outside of the scope of the bill that is before us or is in fact frivolous. In fact, I think he's offered you two arguments.

Let me deal with both of them together. In order for an amendment to be determined to be frivolous, you must look to the relevant decisions and precedents that have been ruled on with respect to that. Most importantly, I would say that you must look to the amendments or frivolous rulings that have been made within this Legislature.

There are not many of them over the years. This is not something that is done lightly. I think that is, as we have witnessed tonight, that the Chairs and the Speakers of this

Legislature have followed that precedent that it is not done lightly. In fact, the last time that an amendment was ruled out of order for being frivolous in this Legislature was in June 1965 and I believe the Chair at the time was Mr Whitney.

0230

At that point in time, the amendment that had been put forward had been put forward by a member of the Legislative Assembly, attempting to change the name of a piece of legislation, a bill that was before the House at that point in time. The Speaker's ruling was that amendment was out of order because it was frivolous and he indicated that he did not think there was any justification for the name, the bill had an original name, and therefore he declared the amendment to be frivolous and out of order. On many other occasions since that time there have been attempts by members to seek a ruling of a frivolous nature of amendments and they have been rejected by Speakers continuously.

If you look to the experts on this, you begin to see why they make their learned arguments about what in fact would cause an amendment to be out of order. Particularly now I want to refer to Erskine May, and I will refer you to page 339, "Rules with respect to form and content of amendments." The most important aspect that is put forward is that, "The fundamental rule," as Erskine May refers to it, "that debate" — and we're talking about amendments — "must be relevant to a question...also means that every amendment must be relevant to the question to which it is proposed."

Mr Chair, in order for you to determine that, you must look to the actual question that is before us, which is shall section 24 of the bill be passed? Section 24 reads as follows: "24(1) The minister may by regulation" do a number of things:

"(a) impose conditions on the exercise of the powers of an old council;

"(b) impose conditions on the exercise of the powers of a local board of an old municipality," etc;

"deal with transitional matters...provide for any other transitional matter...prescribe duties...define any word or expression...."

It's a very broad regulation-setting power under this legislation. The amendment that is in question at this time adds to section 24 conditions which must be met before the minister, as it sets out at the beginning under subsection 24(1) "may by regulation" do a certain number of things. In this case it sets out that the minister may do that if he follows a process of consultation.

In this case the member states that Allstate Parkway is within Mississauga. I would say to you at this point in time that I would be pleased at another opportunity to look as to whether he's correct on that or not. The name has come from the information that we have and has been prepared and has come from a database in cross-referencing with a map. But irrespective of that — I want to put that aside — I would put to you that there is nothing out of the scope or content of the legislation to suggest that people who may be, for example, in the GTA belt be consulted with respect to the aspects of what is happening in the large Metropolitan Toronto area.

You've heard on a number of occasions in the debates that have taken place how interrelated these are, how

people feel. In fact you've heard, I'm sure, Mayor McCallion of Mississauga, who has given very pronounced opinions on this, who has appeared before the committee and has asked that Mississauga in fact be consulted and be part of the process with respect to the changes here and with respect to the changes in the GTA.

I would suggest that even if the member is correct in his allegation, which I have no way to substantiate at this point in time, in fact he is not correct in the argument that he makes with respect to this being outside the scope of the legislation.

I also want to say that the member took considerable time to also start to talk about the nature of the amendment, and he goes on to other amendments which aren't even before us and whether or not they are fair, whether or not they treat people in a discriminatory manner, a lot of arguments which in fact are debates.

As you know, these amendments unfortunately, because of the government's time allocation motion, are not debatable, so we are not in a position of being able to debate the merits of the government's amendments, the official opposition amendments or the third party's amendments. We must only deal with the amendments as they are before us. There is no debate allowed, and I would suggest that all those arguments he put forward which are of an element of debate must be dismissed by you because this is not debatable.

Mr Hampton: On a point of order, Mr Chair —

The Second Deputy Chair: Is this a new point of order or is this on the same one?

Mr Hampton: This is a new point of order, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: I will hear it afterwards, then.

Mr Hampton: It is a related point of order, though, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to address the point of order.

Mrs McLeod: If I may, I will attempt to be helpful as well as brief, Mr Chair. My attempt will be to help the Chair, not to help the government.

I believe that the member has offered three somewhat contradictory reasons for suggesting that this particular resolution might be out of order. One is that it is frivolous, and I suggest to you that on your referral, the Speaker has already ruled that these amendments are not to be considered frivolous. Therefore all amendments that were of a similar nature would be considered to be of —

Mr Gilchrist: Don't put words in the Speaker's mouth.

Mrs McLeod: If the government is suggesting that every one of these resolutions be referred to the Speaker to make the same judgement, we are going to be here for a much longer time than any of us anticipated. That was on your referral that the Speaker made that ruling.

The second argument offered was that this was not relevant, but by the finding of the amendments not being frivolous and allowed to stand, they are also therefore considered to be relevant under the standing orders.

The third reason the member offered was that they were vague. That is contradictory to the argument that they are frivolous and not relevant because they are not specific enough. You have already ruled on that a few amendments ago to say that the amendment could stand. In any event, if

it is a genuine concern for the government, it is easily rectified.

Mr Hampton: On a point of order, Mr Chair: This is related to what has already gone on before.

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to be very specific, because if it's on this point of order, then I will hear it. If it is not on this point of order, I will not.

Mr Hampton: It's on this point of order, Mr Chair. I want you to reflect on what the member for Scarborough East has tried to do here. The government passed a time allocation motion which in effect limited debate on motions. This member tried to use a point of order to get up and debate this particular motion. This member —

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to know your point.

Mr Hampton: The point is that the member listed arguments as to why he disapproves of this amendment. Those reasons he listed may lead him to vote against the amendment, but he cannot use a point of order to get up and debate a motion, and that's what he's trying to do. He's trying to debate this amendment, and the rules which we are operating under now prohibit debate of those amendments. The member cannot do by the back door what the time allocation motion will not permit him to do by the front door. If the member wants to vote against this, he is perfectly able to vote against it, but we're not to engage in debate of particular amendments at this point in time in this process.

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to explain to you that the very thing you are asking him to do is what you are doing. I've heard you and I will have one more, and I want to go in rotation.

The Chair recognizes the minister there.

Hon Rob Sampson (Minister without Portfolio [Privatization]): Whatever.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm sorry. Scarborough —

Hon Mr Sampson: It's Mississauga. I've been called better and maybe worse, Mr Chair, and that's fine.

I will attempt to speak to the point of order that's been raised by my colleague for Mississauga West.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): I'm Mississauga South.

Hon Mr Sampson: And don't ever forget it. You know what? It's just six o'clock, Mr Chair. Sometimes we have to have these liberties.

I will speak to the point that's been raised by my colleague from Scarborough because I believe, as I understand his point, he is trying to draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that, not only in the instance he spoke to there, some names are listed in these amendments that are not within the area that's under consideration by this bill — the one I believe he raised is in Mississauga — but he also drew attention to the fact that there are some streets, as he's able to follow the progression of the amendments so far, that are not included.

As I see the progression here, as we move through these amendments, I'm beginning to become a little more alarmed when I connect that to the comment that was made by our colleague from Beaches-Woodbine. I believe her words were — I don't have Hansard to read them back from — that "it is not necessary for each street to be included in the bundle of amendments that we have coming before us" related to this particular topic. I can understand

then that there must be some purpose in my colleagues across the floor, I would say, purposely excluding some streets from the enumeration. I'm becoming a bit alarmed by that.

While I think there have been previous decisions that have talked about issues around constitutionality, the exclusion of some parties against the other and whether that is constitutional, it's not within the purview of this House to consider whether amendments are constitutional. I put to you, sir, that it is appropriate for this House to make sure that amendments they are considering attaching to pieces of legislation deal with issues of authority that this House has to grant. I say to you that it is not within the purview of this House — it may be in another House, it may be in Ottawa but it's not in the purview of this House — to do what I believe the opposition parties intend to do with this legislation, which is to purposely include streets and residents of the area in a particular amendment and also purposely exclude. I'm not asking for a determination on the constitutionality.

The Second Deputy Chair: This was a point of order addressed by the member for Scarborough East. I am ruling that it is not a point of order. I have no way of determining the legal accuracy of whether Allstate Parkway is within or without the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto. I have to assume that they are within because of the data base and the information that the members used to put this in and that is my ruling.

Mr Gilchrist: Thank you, Mr Chair. I would challenge your ruling and ask you to refer to the Speaker.

The committee recessed from 0245 to 0250.

APPEAL OF THE CHAIR'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Speaker, the committee of the whole would like to report that we have a point of order being raised. It's being raised by the member for Scarborough East. We are dealing with an NDP motion that among other things proposes that Allstate Parkway should be included in this amendment. The member for Scarborough East alleges that this is a street only in the municipality of Mississauga and that it would bring mockery and discrimination into this bill by including this in the thing. They will want to speak to you about this. This is the motion.

The Speaker (Hon Chris Stockwell): Thank you. The member for Scarborough East, I had the opportunity to listen intently to the points of order that were raised. I consider it a serious point of order. I say to the members of the opposition as well, I heard the points of view offered by yourselves. I would just say to you that if you feel so inclined to restate them, I would never turn down a point of order, but I'll tell you, I think I've got the thrust of your thoughts.

Mr Gilchrist: If I might quote from the bill, Mr Speaker, "urban area" means the area that, immediately before section 27 comes into force, comprises the geographic area of jurisdiction of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto under the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act."

I guess the only point I would make is that at the outset the undertaking that you were given and the statements

made by the third party were in fact that these were streets within Metropolitan Toronto. In response to an earlier round table discussion about a previous amendment, the member for Beaches-Woodbine stated categorically that she had it on valid authority that the names being submitted were compiled from a database of only those streets. In fact she gave a slightly different answer to you than what she told us. She said it was from a voters' list. She told you it was from an authority called Metro Art. I think perhaps she meant MapArt.

From an authority I think second to none, Perly, there is only one Allstate Parkway. It is not in the boundary that is the scope of this bill. This is not some arcane legal definition. The bill describes the territory which is the subject under discussion here today. Unless she can cite an authority which refutes Perly, the number-one-selling map book in all of Canada, then it's clearly outside the scope of this bill.

Mr Speaker, I do not want to have to call you back in probably every five minutes. These are just a few of the subsequent amendments that fall into exactly the same category. I have no choice but to draw your attention to all of those as well. Some of these amendments refer to cities on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. Some of these refer to lakes in northern Ontario. Some of these refer to things that aren't even streets, like Lamport Stadium. I don't think anyone lives in Lamport Stadium.

In your ruling to the first amendment of the 8,000, you quite correctly suggested that it was the first amendment; you could in fact deduce no pattern from that one. Mr Speaker, that ruling was made five hours ago, five hours and barely over 100 amendments. But the bottom line is that we are now coming to the point where we have seen the absolute and complete disregard of the integrity of this process.

0300

These are not the streets in Metropolitan Toronto. This is a dilatory tactic as offensive as anything I have seen in the 20 months I have been in this chamber. To suggest that two wrongs make a right and because a previous member once read the lakes and streams somehow makes it okay, I cannot accept. The bottom line is this bill is very simple: It was the bringing together of the seven cities into one new jurisdiction. How anyone — not you, Mr Speaker — could deduce that to refer to a single street is somehow consistent with the tone and tenor of bills — I admit with only two years' experience my time frame is far less comprehensive than yours, but if there has ever been another bill that came forward, an MNR bill that dealt with specific streams, a bill that dealt with sewers and then went on and listed every sewer main in the province, a bill that in any way broke down into this sort of detail and was seen by the Speaker as being appropriate, then I would genuinely appreciate that precedent.

Mr Speaker, I think you have on the face the obvious evidence that this is nothing more than a dilatory tactic and I think it is offensive to all the members and it is offensive to the taxpayers, at the cost of \$1,000 a minute to operate this chamber, that we indulge this for the hours and the days it will take to read 8,000 defective amendments that are not consistent with the spirit of this bill and that are

absolutely at odds with the definition itself at the introduction.

Ms Lankin: Mr Speaker, I'm going to try to observe your request and be brief and not to repeat the points that I made earlier. I would like to address two things in response to the member for Scarborough East. Firstly I would point out that he is absolutely incorrect to suggest that I have on the record at any time led the members of this House to believe that these lists were prepared from voters' lists. I think it's quite irrelevant as a point of order but I simply wanted to make that very clear, because I believe that the member would have left people with a different impression.

I do want to speak to the point of the amendment which is before you, which is the amendment with respect to Allstate Parkway, not any others that may be coming in the future, and say that the process by which we undertook to bring together the lists of amendments was taken from a database and cross-referenced with a map. At this point in time I cannot verify that the member is absolutely correct in what he is asserting. I don't know the answer to that. I believe that we in all good faith have attempted to bring together a list which reflected our intent.

I can tell you that in the doing of that there were certain things, as we went through and culled the list, that we deleted ourselves, like reference, for example, to the Eaton's Centre. There was one previously that as we came across it I saw that it in fact perhaps should have been culled out and I withdrew it at that point in time, which I think is the appropriate way to deal with these things and the way in which I would intend to continue to deal with these things as I sit here and monitor them very carefully as we go through them.

I would just say in response to the member's verbiage with respect to shoddy research work etc, the number of amendments that we are facing with this bill from the government in terms of areas where you're looking at corrections and you call it housekeeping, these things are quite normal in the course of debates on bills and amendments on bills. I would intend to proceed and, where appropriate, withdraw those amendments that have somehow been submitted contrary to the intent of the honourable members of my party who have worked on proceeding and producing these amendments.

The Speaker: Minister and member for Mississauga West.

Hon Rob Sampson (Minister without Portfolio [Privatization]): I'm going to put a name tag in front here one of these days, Mr Speaker, to help everybody.

I will indeed be brief. I rose on my colleague from Scarborough's point of order because it really reflected my concern and the concern I've been getting as we've gone through these amendments and some of the comments and discussion that's been coming out so far that clearly there are some areas of the city that will be missed when the assembly of these amendments are put together and considered either in whole or in part at some time, in the near future, I hope.

My concern, Mr Speaker, is not necessarily whether it's appropriate to have one excluded or not, because that's really a constitutional issue. We've had decisions in this House by previous Speakers that it's not up to this House

or the Speaker to determine the constitutionality of any particular amendment and I'm not asking that that be considered here. What I am asking to be considered is whether it's appropriate for us to consider amendments, either on their own or in a collection of amendments, that will create laws coming out of this Legislature that aren't within the purview of this Legislature to create, and those are laws that will determine the rights of one group of people versus the lack of rights of others. Clearly that's what will happen if we proceed, as proposed by the NDP, to be willing to accept some streets as opposed to others. The amendment reads that specifically residents as opposed to — clearly, since they've named residents, there would be non-residents on a particular street who would be excluded from the rights and privileges allocated to them under this legislation. So I'm not asking that we determine whether the amendments are constitutional, but I'm asking to consider whether it's appropriate for laws and amendments to be considered in this House that are clearly not within the purview of this jurisdiction to consider. The rights and privileges of people are allocated to us by a senior jurisdiction, not this House. Rights and privileges of the people in this province are allocated to the people of this province by the Constitution of this country, not by this House. Constitutional matters should be considered by the judiciary — it's 3 o'clock and it's hard to get that out — not by this House. We shouldn't consider whether a particular amendment is constitutional, but I think it's appropriate for us to consider whether a particular amendment is within the purview of this House to actually create laws against, and that's the point that I rose to speak to when my colleague from Scarborough rose, and that's the point that I would put to you, sir, to give consideration to.

The Speaker: I'd just like to question the member for Mississauga West to help me clarify this. How would that square with the position of the trustees on Bill 103 and Bill 104 and the position of the government?

Hon Mr Sampson: I can't speak to that one because that's not before us here today, sir. The point before us today is this particular amendment and the series of amendments before us. I have not put my mind to the question you've asked me because it's not within the context. I can't help you on that one.

The Speaker: I'm going to go to the leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: Speaker, I made this argument before. You may have heard it, so I'll just restate it briefly. I think what you're hearing here both from Mr Sampson and from Mr Gilchrist is they try to use a point of order to engage in arguments of debate. What I think I'm hearing over here are reasons why Mr Sampson would vote against these amendments. There are probably good reasons for Mr Sampson, given his picture of the world, to vote against these amendments, but I would say to you, Speaker, the government's own time allocation motion forbids debate at this time on the merits of an amendment, whether the amendment is a good amendment or whether the amendment is favourable to these folks or not favourable to other folks.

Mr Sampson is trying to engage in debate on the merits of an amendment when our time allocation motion which the government forced through clearly says you can't

debate the merits. As for Mr Gilchrist, the member for Scarborough East, he wants to base a point of order on an allegation. He rises and he cites some street index book and he wants to base a point of order on an allegation.

Speaker, as far as I know, points of order are to deal with the rules of order of this House, not on allegations, not on allegation as to whether someone, for example, misled the House or some information. So I think what you heard here are two members who are trying to engage in debate on a particular amendment. I really don't think there's a point of order here.

The Speaker: I'll go back to the member for Mississauga West.

Hon Mr Sampson: Again, I want to reflect on two things, if I can. I thought I had mentioned in my comments that I clearly did not want to get into the merits of the amendment. I didn't want to get into whether it was constitutional, whether it's appropriate to exclude one group of residents on a street versus non-residents, to include one street and not the street. That's not the point I rose on. The point was, whether it's appropriate for this House to consider amendments and, if they get attached to legislation, the legislation that's not within the authority of this House to consider. I'll go to the point that you've challenged me on, sir —

The Speaker: No, it was clarification —

Hon Mr Sampson: — asked for clarification on, in regard to how this related to the trustee item. I think the point there was we were indeed discussing the merits of whether the appointment of trustees was constitutional or not constitutional, not whether it's within the jurisdiction of this House to eventually create the trustee board to deal with its authorities as drafted within the legislation. I would put to you that it is within the purview of this House to create that legislation. The debate we had at that time, as I recall, was whether it was constitutional to have them in effect before the bill was passed. That is the merit issue. What I'm trying to drive at is, how can it be appropriate for us to consider amendments that will deal with items that this jurisdiction has no authority to deal with? We have no authority in this House to deal with allocating fundamental rights of citizens. That is not within the authority of this House. That's within the authority of the government of Canada, which sets the Constitution in the ways in which it sets the Constitution, which sets our bill of rights in the way it sets our bill of rights. We must be governed by those. We can't change those in this House.

Mrs McLeod: I'll be very brief in response to the points of order raised by both the member for Mississauga West and the member for Scarborough East. In terms of the member for Mississauga West, I would agree with him when he suggested this is a serious alternative, which of course is in direct contradiction to the point made by his colleague from Scarborough East, who considers it to be frivolous and therefore should not be in order. I take the member for Mississauga West seriously when he says it's a serious amendment. I would urge that if there are genuine concerns about the constitutionality of any part of Bill 103 we would recommend to the government that it does what we've recommend it do on Bill 104, and that is to voluntarily seek a reference to the Court of Appeal to determine the constitutionality or lack of it of both Bill 103 and Bill 104.

There is precedent for this; it was done by a Liberal government when it referred Bill 30 voluntarily to a Court of Appeal in order to avoid very costly court challenges that would go to the Supreme Court level.

In response to the member for Scarborough East, who suggests that the amendments before us are dilatory and therefore in his view offensive to the Legislature, I would respectfully suggest that none of these amendments would be here if the government of the day had not decided to use its majority to put through legislation which is clearly in direct violation of the expressed views of a majority of its citizens. I find that offensive, and for any member of this government to argue the rights of those citizens is truly offensive.

Ms Lankin: In response to the member for Mississauga West, he seems to be arguing that the nature of the amendments before us are fundamental rights of citizenship that are somehow, I guess by his argument, being proceeded on in a discriminatory way. I would just remind you, Mr Speaker, that the amendments before us are with respect to a consultation process and who must be consulted with respect to the question in section 24, which is before the minister may make a regulation. That's what we're dealing with. I would point to other statutes that have passed this Legislature and have been deemed to be constitutional, although I know the member and his party disagreed and then revoked the legislation.

I would point out, for example, employment equity legislation or many types of legislation which create certain laws and activities and/or rights for individuals within the province. I, quite frankly, see no merit in the argument that he has put forward.

The Speaker: I'd like to thank the members for their submission. I think I'll take 10 minutes to recess, to take an opportunity to review this, and maybe take a break for 10 minutes of the House. It may be helpful, I think, at this time.

The House recessed from 0315 to 0328.

The Speaker: I appreciate the points of order offered by the members from all three parties.

Let me deal with the member for Mississauga West. I appreciate the points that he made, but the difficulty I'm faced with is, it's my job as Speaker of the House and the Chair of the committee to determine whether or not an amendment is in order. Now, there are certain requirements to determine whether that amendment is in order or is not in order.

From the thrust of the point of order offered, there's a question about whether these amendments would penalize certain people who lived on certain streets that aren't named in the amendments as a bloc. That may well be true and I'm not suggesting for a moment that the member for Mississauga West is not making a valid argument, but I don't believe the argument you're making is an argument about whether the amendment is in order; it's an argument about whether it's legal to do that. That must be taken up properly before the courts.

I asked the question with respect to Bill 103 and Bill 104 because I ruled very similarly to that not too long ago with respect to the trustees who were ruled on in Bill 104. The opposition asked for a relationship back to Bill 103, and my position then is the one I'm going to put forward again

today. Those bills, pieces of legislation that were before the House, were in order. Whether they're legal is not a question that I want to decide upon. I can't set myself up as judge and jury. I can only determine whether they're in order according to the standing orders of this House, and they were.

Subsequently, the amendment that's before us, from my review, is properly before us by our orders. If it's determined at a later date not to be legal, that's for a different body altogether, for the judiciary, and that's something they would have to take up before the courts.

To move to the member for Scarborough East, we have three principles we work under with respect to this House. You have the standing orders, which are supreme; and then you have precedents, and they stand second behind the standing orders; and then you move down to parliamentary authorities. The parliamentary authorities we work under are Beauchesne and Erskine May; it isn't Beauchesne, Erskine May, and Perly's. I say that with the greatest respect.

The difficulty you put the Speaker in is that I'm now having to rule on the basis of a Perly's map. I'm not discrediting the fact that you may be correct, but I can't do that. I can only rule as to the amendment being in order, and whether or not the members put these in as honourable members — I presume certain things. I can't presume, because you have a map that says it's not there, that it's not there, because then we could be faced with the unenviable situation of working our way through how many map companies determining whether or not a street or any portion thereof is properly in Metro.

I appreciate the points you made and I'm not questioning the validity of your argument with respect to whether it's inside or outside of Metro. The question I have to rely on is that I only have three places to go: the standing orders; what we use as tradition in this place, precedent; and Beauchesne and Erskine May. When I go there, there's nothing that says it's not in order.

I appreciate the opportunity to come back and express an opinion, make some rulings on some of those issues, but from my reading, my review, I don't think either of the points of order would stand and I would see those amendments as being in order.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO

(continued)

The First Deputy Chair (Ms Marilyn Churley): I have an NDP motion.

Mr Hampton: At this rate, it's an hour and a half per amendment.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please. We're dealing with an NDP motion.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allstate Parkway living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allstate Parkway living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Allview Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Allview Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alma Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alma Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

0340

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alma Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alma Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Almont Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Almont Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Almont Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Almont Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Almore Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Almore Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Ms Lankin: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: With respect to the next amendment, I'll have to ask you to check the copies you have at the table. I believe it inadvertently is a duplicate of the amendment that was just defeated and I would withdraw it on that basis.

0350

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you very much.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alness Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alness Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alonzo Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alonzo Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alpaca Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alpaca Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alpha Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alpha Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alpine Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alpine Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alrita Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alrita Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0400

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Altair Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Altair Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Altamont Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Altamont Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Althea Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Althea Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alton Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alton Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alvin Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alvin Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alvinson Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alvinson Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0410

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Alyward Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Alyward Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amanda Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amanda Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amaranth Court in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amaranth Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amarillo Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amarillo Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4).

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amaran Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amaran Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

- “5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,
- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
 - “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
 - “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
 - “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0420

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ambassador Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ambassador Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amber Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amber Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Motion deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ambercroft Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ambercroft Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amberdale Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amberdale Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amberjack Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amberjack Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amberley Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amberley Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0430

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amberwood Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amberwood Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ambleside Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ambleside Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amboy Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amboy Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ambrose Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ambrose Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ameer Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ameer Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0440

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amelia Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amelia Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the amendment please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ames Circle living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ames Circle living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ames Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ames Gate living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Ms Lankin: On a point of order, Madam Chair: I don't believe there's a quorum.

The First Deputy Chair: Is there a quorum?

Acting Clerk Assistant (Mr Todd Decker): Madam Chair, a quorum is not present.

The First Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.

Acting Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present, Madam Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: All right. NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amesbury Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amesbury Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ames Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ames Gate living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0450

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amethyst Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amethyst Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amherst Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amherst Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amiens Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amiens Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amoro Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amoro Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amos Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amos Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ampleford Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ampleford Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0500

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amroth Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amroth Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amsterdam Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amsterdam Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Amulet Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Amulet Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anaconda Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anaconda Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ancaster Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ancaster Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anchor Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anchor Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0510

The Chair: NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ancona Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ancona Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ancroft Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ancroft Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anderson Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anderson Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andes Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Andes Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): Mr Chair, I don't think we have a quorum in the House.

The Chair: Would you please verify if there is quorum?

Acting Clerk Assistant (Ms Lisa Freedman): A quorum is not present.

The Chair: Call in the members.

The Chair ordered the bells rung.

Acting Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present.

The Chair: NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andona Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Andona Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” That's the spirit. In my opinion the nays have it. Deferred vote.

We had a point of order?

0520

Mrs Helen Johns (Huron): A point of order: I think the NDP would like to dispense with the reading of these motions because we've been going through them for a number of hours now. I think we all know what they are and it would be better for us just to continue to vote. Can I get the NDP to agree to dispense with these —

Interjections: No.

Mrs Johns: I think we all know what they are by now.

Interjections.

Mr Gerretsen: How do you know? Give me the name of the next street. What's the name of the next street?

Interjections.

The Chair: Order, order. An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andover Crescent living in the urban area shall be made —”

Interjections.

The Chair: Order, order. The member for Huron. It's nice that everybody's awake. Please pay attention to what I read now. I'm going to have to read it again.

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andover Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Andover Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” That's the spirit. In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Interjections.

The Chair: The member for York-Mackenzie, please.

An NDP motion:

Mr Ron Johnson (Brantford): Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andrew Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Andrew Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

Ms Lankin: Point of order, Mr Chair: I would like to withdraw this amendment.

The Chair: The next one is an NDP motion.

Mr Ron Johnson: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Andrews living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Andrews living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

Mr Ron Johnson: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aneta Circle living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aneta Circle living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

Mr Ron Johnson: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anewen Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anewen Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion be carried? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0530

NDP motion.

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Angel Court living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Angel Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order, order.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anglesey Blvd living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anglesey Blvd living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Angora Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Angora Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation —"

Interjections.

The Chair: I would ask you to come to order. If not, I will ask you to leave.

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

Mr Ron Johnson: Same vote.

The Chair: Dispense?

Mr Ron Johnson: Same vote.

The Chair: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Angus Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Angus Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation —

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ann Arbour Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ann Arbour Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation —

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0540

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anna Hilliard Lane living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anna Hilliard Lane living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annabelle Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annabelle Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." All those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annan Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annan Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annapearl Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annapearl Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense?

Interjections: No.

The Chair: “I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annaree Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annaree Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense?

Interjections: No.

0550

The Chair: “I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anndale Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anndale Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anndale Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anndale Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anneke Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anneke Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Mr Gilchrist: Mr Chairman, only four members who are in their chairs rose for that. I don’t believe there’s a second opportunity.

The Chair: I counted five.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection —”

Interjections.

The Chair: Dispense?

Interjections: No.

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annesley Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annesley Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annette Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annette Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense?

Interjections: No.

The Chair: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Annis Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Annis Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0600

NDP motion:

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anola Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anola Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ansell Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ansell Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection —"

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ansford Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ansford Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection —"

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ansley Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ansley Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anson Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anson Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0610

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anthia Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anthia Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): It’s not often you’re up this early in the morning and still sober.

Interjection: Welcome back. We missed you for quite a while.

Mr Gilchrist: Chair, I would ask you to —

The Chair: No, if you have a point of order, you have to do it from your seat.

Mr Gilchrist: All right, stand by. Mr Chair, I would ask that the member for Welland-Thorold retract those last comments.

The Chair: I didn’t hear anything.

Mr Kormos: I implied he was still sober but I’ll retract it.

The Chair: I’d like you to pay attention to the next motion, an NDP motion.

Hon Mr Sampson: Mr Chair, on a point of order: I believe the Speaker set a precedent that if a member is asked to withdraw, he withdraws, no ifs, ands or buts. I did

not hear an unconditional withdrawal from the member opposite.

The Chair: I think you’re right. I didn’t ask him to withdraw. The member for Welland-Thorold, would you please withdraw the comment?

Mr Kormos: I implied he was still sober but I withdraw my comment.

The Chair: Just say, “I withdraw the comment.”

Mr Kormos: Yes, of course, Chair, I withdraw it.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs Marland: Mr Chair, on a point of order: I think it’s a little unfair for those people who are coming in who have had the benefit of some rest —

Interjections.

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): Only 17 days left, Margaret.

Mrs Marland: If you think it’s a joke, then why are we here? We’re just wasting everybody’s time if you think it’s a joke.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order.

Mrs Marland: I think for the member for Welland-Thorold to talk about somebody’s sobriety is out of order in this House whether it’s 5:30 in the morning or 5:30 in the afternoon. It happens to be 6:15 in the morning and there are some of us who have been here since 1:30 yesterday afternoon and I take very strong exception to the member for Welland-Thorold and I ask you to call him to order.

The Chair: The member for Mississauga South —

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. I already asked him to withdraw.

Mrs Marland: And he repeated his statement.

The Chair: I’m satisfied.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection — ”

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents — ”

Interjections.

The Chair: Order.

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anthony Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anthony Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Antibes Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Antibes Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anticosti Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anticosti Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0620

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Antioch Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Antioch Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Antler Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Antler Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Antrim Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Antrim Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. A deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Anvil Millway living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Anvil Millway living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. A deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apache Trail living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apache Trail living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. A deferred vote.

0630

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apex Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apex Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apollo Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apollo Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appian Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appian Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appleby Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appleby Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appledale Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appledale Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appleby Road living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appleby Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0640

An NDP motion:

Mrs Johns: Dispense.

The Chair: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): Now if you were to dispense with the bill.

Mrs Johns: We've heard this over 200 times now.

The Chair: Member for Huron, I can't hear myself here.

Mrs Johns: Yes, I'm here. That's right.

The Chair: "Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Applefield Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Applefield Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

Mr Gerretsen: The spaceship is landing this afternoon.

The Chair: Member for Kingston and The Islands.

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Applegate Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Applegate Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Applemore Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Applemore Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appleton Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appleton Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0650

NDP motion:

I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Appletree Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Appletree Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apsco Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apsco Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apsley Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apsley Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section" —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Apted Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Apted Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aquila Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aquila Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0700

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aragon Avenue living in the urban area” —

Interjection: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense? No.

— shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aragon Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Araman Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Araman Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Mrs Marland: Chair.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mrs Marland: I’m just asking you —

The Chair: Stand up and you can address the —

Mrs Marland: Oh, thank you, Mr Chair, and good morning. I’m very glad to have this opportunity to speak. I was simply asking you, Mr Chair, in that last vote, I did observe five members of the third party standing. However, I did not hear whether you deferred the vote or not. That’s what I was eagerly waiting for, because that’s the only

excitement at the end of each vote, is to know whether it's been deferred or not.

The Chair: Perhaps you were distracted, but I did say "deferred."

Mrs Marland: Distracted? I'm rapt.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: If I may, here we are at 7:05 am on Thursday morning at Queen's Park. The doors are open. The public is invited, and they're welcome here, as they will be all day and all night, filling these galleries. I'm sure the public will assist in counting the number of people standing, should that be required. I want to welcome the public down to Queen's Park.

The Chair: The member for Welland-Thorold, did you say that you had a point of order?

Mr Kormos: Yes. The point of order, Chair, was to mention that this is a public building to which the public is invited, even here at 7:05 am on Thursday morning, all day, all night, all day, all night. Thank you.

The Chair: It's not quite a point of order.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I would suggest to you that we now have won, since the member for Welland-Thorold is begging for the public to come in here and oppose this legislation. If the public were as concerned as he was, I would suggest that they might be here.

The Chair: That's not a point of order.

Mr Kormos: Chair, the public is here, and the public has been here all night, and they'll be here today, they'll be here this morning, they'll be here this afternoon, they'll be here tonight, they'll be here at 2 in the morning, at 4 in the morning and 5 in the morning, just like they're watching on their televisions across Ontario.

The Chair: Now we'll deal with serious matters.

An NDP motion: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Araz Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Araz Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation."

Interjections.

The Chair: There should be no discussions or exchange of words between the gallery and the members on the floor.

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0710

The Second Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arbordell living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arbordell living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote has been deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arbordell Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arbordell Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote has been deferred.

The member for Welland-Thorold on a point of order.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: You can just call me Pete or Peter Kormos, if you wish. Chair, even with my earpiece, the rapidity with which you're reading these, you're incoherent and slurred. I can't understand what the Chair is reading on to the record.

The Second Deputy Chair: Please sit down. I'm doing the very best I can. If you can hear it, fine; if not, you'll have to be quiet.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: Can I sit closer to the Chair, perhaps at the table? That might be of assistance.

The Second Deputy Chair: You can sit anywhere, as long as you're quiet.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arborwood Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arborwood Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arbroath Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arbroath Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arbutus Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arbutus Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: This is not an auction sale. This sounds like something out of a TV sitcom. As I say, Chair, I wish you'd listen to yourself, because your speech is growing increasingly slurred and incoherent. We can't understand what you're saying. None of us have all of these amendments before us. If the Chair would arrange for these amendments to be photocopied, so that each member would have a copy of these amendments, then I could tolerate your slurred, incoherent manner of reading these on to the record. But otherwise, I'm telling you, Chair, we simply can't understand what you're saying, nor can the public listening at home or the people here in the galleries at 7:20 in the morning on Thursday. This is grossly unfair to the members of the public, who want to hear what you're saying and who don't have earpieces and who can't, as I'm able to, stand beside you and read as you're reading.

The Second Deputy Chair: We'll ask you to just follow along in the copy you have. If it sounds slurred to you, then you can leave any time. I'm going to be here till 10 after 9.

Mrs Marland: On the same point of order, Mr Chair: I'm sorry that the member for Welland-Thorold is having difficulty hearing you and is suggesting that you are slurred and incoherent, because I think that is a very rude comment to make to the Chair, because you are neither slurred nor incoherent. It's all gamesmanship on the part of the member for Welland-Thorold, because he knows full well that every single one of these NDP amendments that we've now been reading for 18 hours is identical wording all the way through the amendment except for one word that changes, and that's the name of the street. For him to sit there and say that he needs a copy in front of him — it's very easy if he wants to read each street individually. The NDP amendments are sitting in a box right in front of his desk. He has full access to reading them himself. I think it's a little unfortunate that he is insulting you through his own gamesmanship.

The Second Deputy Chair: I am so glad —

Mr Kormos: It's no insult, Chair, no insult at all.

The Second Deputy Chair: Please take your seat. I'd like to compliment the member for Mississauga South on her hearing, excellent.

The member for Scarborough-Agincourt had a point of order. One moment, please.

I will not tolerate being interrupted. I am chairing this meeting, and if you have a point, I'd like you to stand up and get my attention without this interruption. I'm warning you.

Mr Kormos: A point of order, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: No. The Chair recognizes the member for Scarborough-Agincourt on a point of order.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I too would like to come to your defence. I can understand what you are saying, clearly. I think you're performing an important role. I think the

public recognize that we are dealing with a bill that Mike Harris, when he was in opposition, said that he would never get rid of the city of Scarborough or the city of Toronto.

We're dealing with a bill where overwhelmingly, the people of Ontario have voted against it, the people of Metropolitan Toronto, 75% voted against it. We're dealing with a bill where we now have the incredible idea of 57 people on a council, a completely unworkable, crazy idea.

I'm very supportive of you, Mr Speaker, in ensuring that the people of Ontario have an opportunity to properly review it. So you certainly have my support.

The Second Deputy Chair: That really is not a point of order. The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I want to make it quite clear that I have no concerns about your capacity as a Chair. All I am saying is that already my office has received two phone calls from members of public who are saying that you're reading so quickly that your speech is slurred and incoherent. They can't understand what you're saying.

If there were words across the bottom, it might improve it. I didn't mean any disrespect to you, but you are simply reading too quickly, such that your language — you're not enunciating, Chair, and you can't last long at that pace. It simply isn't going to last long.

Mr Wildman: Mr Chair, on a point of order, could I suggest —

The Second Deputy Chair: No, no. Please take your seat.

Mr Wildman: I just wanted to suggest —

The Second Deputy Chair: You will take your seat, or I will name you. I want to address the member for Welland-Thorold.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is not a point of order. This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arcade Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arcade Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. I declare this motion lost.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arcadian Cir living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arcadian Cir living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion — yes, your point of order?

Mr Kormos: Chair, I just listened to the French-language version of your reading of these, and I note that the interpreter simply cannot keep up with you. It would be impossible for the most fluent and capable French-language interpreter to do that.

To deny French-language viewers the right to hear this in the French language is an insult to them and a violation, quite frankly, of Bill 8. In the name, sir, of Bill 8, please address this in a clear and clearly enunciated manner so that the interpreters, hardworking people for whom I know you have regard, can properly and adequately and accurately translate your English language to the French language. I beg you sir. You’re doing a disservice to the interpreters and to our French-language viewers.

Your slurred words and the rapidity with which you’re reading these are doing a disservice across this province, sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: I would remind the member that this is Bill 103.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Archer Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Archer Street living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“‘iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“‘Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Archerhill Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“‘1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Archerhill Drive living in the urban area.

“‘2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“‘3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“‘4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“‘5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“‘i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“‘ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“‘iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is this committee in favour of this NDP motion? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Archway Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Archway Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0730

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Archwood Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Archwood Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arcot Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arcot Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardagh Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardagh Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." Those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardell Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardell Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This also is an NDP motion: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arden Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arden Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arden Thorpe Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arden Thorpe Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardgowan Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardgowan Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0740

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardrossan Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardrossan Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this House this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardtrea Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardtrea Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardua Street living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardua Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” You can’t vote if you’re not in your seat. All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Wildman: On a point of order, Mr Chair: We’ve received a call from Mr Bill Russell of the city of Toronto who’s watching TV and is upset that the Speaker is talking too fast. Mr Russell wants to hear and follow what’s going on and asked me to pass this on to you, so I’m doing that.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Chair: I was upstairs making some inquiries over the last few minutes. I am deathly afraid of whether or not Hansard will be able to accurately transcribe what the Chair is reading on to the record. I am also very fearful that notwithstanding the high-tech nature of the closed-captioning, it simply doesn’t have the capacity to acknowledge slurred and incoherent speech.

In that respect, with concern about the integrity of this very proceeding, without a Hansard record we’re doomed to have to repeat this, I fear. We may have to undergo the whole process of addressing all these motions again, some 11,000-plus of them. Chair, I prevail upon you, in the interests of the integrity of this Parliament, to please enunciate and avoid your slurred and incoherent style.

The Second Deputy Chair: I’ve already ruled. That is not a point of order, and this Chair is taking a little bit of exception to your personal comments towards me and I am considering it very seriously because I don’t want it to continue.

Mr Phillips: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Just on behalf of the Speaker, to once again say that we are very supportive of the work you’re doing. We’re dealing with a bill that I think the public understand goes 100% contrary to what Mike Harris said before the election. He said, “No megacity,” and now he’s got a megacity. As you know, Mr Speaker, over 75% of the people voted and said no to this bill. We now find amendments, as you pointed out, introduced just a few days ago with a 57-member council, and

every person I've talked to, including most of the Conservative back bench, thinks it's crazy — 57 people on a council.

I think you're doing a fine job. I think the people of Ontario are beginning to recognize what we're dealing with here: Mike Harris broke his promise on the megacity, the people of Metropolitan Toronto said no, and the amendments are crazy. The Conservative amendments are crazy. A 57-person council won't work. You have our full support, Mr Speaker, as you attempt to point out to the people of Ontario we're dealing with a bill that is completely wrong.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'll address that in a moment.

Mrs Marland: Mr Chair, I believe that you've now been insulted three times by the member for Welland-Thorold in his suggestion that your speech is slurred and incoherent. I find that absolutely unacceptable and distasteful and frankly I think you should exercise your prerogative to ask him to withdraw his comments describing how you are speaking, because if there's one person in this House who shouldn't accuse anybody else about whether their speech is slurred and incoherent, it's the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Kormos: I should address this, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: Please take your seat.

Mr Kormos: Ms Marland has raised —

The Second Deputy Chair: Please take your seat. I am warning the member to take his seat. I am ruling that is not on the same point of order and I'm addressing the point of order that is not a point of order for the member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

Mr Kormos: On a point of privilege, Chair: I'm so concerned that Ms Marland might be suggesting that I'm suggesting something that I'm not. Don't shoot the messenger. The building is in an uproar. The city's in an uproar. People across Ontario are trying to watch this and understand what these motions are saying and you're not enunciating. Chair, don't shoot the messenger. Certainly no disrespect to you, of all people, but it's incomprehensible when you go and watch it on television. Chair, I invite you to go watch it on television as you're speaking and you'll understand what people are saying.

0750

The Second Deputy Chair: First of all, this Chair is conducting this meeting for the people in this committee only. So I'm ruling that it's not a matter of privilege whether people on television can hear.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardwick Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardwick Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardwick Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardwick Gate living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ares Court living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ares Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argate Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argate Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argatia living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argatia living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This also is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argo Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argo Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

““iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

““iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.””

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

““Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argonaut Place in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

““1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argonaut Place living in the urban area.

““2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

““3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

““4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

““5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

““i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

““ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

““iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

““iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.””

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Report continues in volume D.

CONTENTS

Thursday 3 April 1997

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE City of Toronto Act, 1996,

Bill 103, *Mr Leach*

The Chair	7591, 7635
The Acting Chair (Mrs Marland)	7595
The Second Deputy Chair	7598, 7653
Mr Gilchrist	7604
Mrs McLeod	7604
Ms Lankin	7604
Mr Kennedy	7616
Mr Hampton	7617
Mr Sampson	7617
The First Deputy Chair	7621
Mrs Johns	7637
Mr Kormos	7653
Mrs Marland	7653
Mr Phillips	7655
Mr Wildman	7660

OTHER BUSINESS

Appeal of Chair's ruling

The Second Deputy Chair	7618
Mr Gilchrist	7618
Ms Lankin	7618
Mr Sampson	7619
Mr Hampton	7619
Mrs McLeod	7620
The Speaker	7620

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

COMITÉ PLÉNIER DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE Loi de 1996 sur la cité de Toronto, projet de loi 103, *M. Leach*

ZON
1
523

1180-2987



No. 176D

N° 176D

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 36th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 36^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Thursday 3 April 1997

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

Speaker
Honourable Chris Stockwell

Président
L'honorable Chris Stockwell

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. Our address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/hansard.htm>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

Notre adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance :

Renseignements sur l'Index

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au 416-325-7410 ou 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 3 April 1997

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

Report continued from volume C.

0800

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1996

LOI DE 1996 SUR LA CITÉ DE TORONTO

Continuing consideration of Bill 103, An Act to replace the seven existing municipal governments of Metropolitan Toronto by incorporating a new municipality to be known as the City of Toronto / Projet de loi 103, Loi visant à remplacer les sept administrations municipales existantes de la communauté urbaine de Toronto en constituant une nouvelle municipalité appelée la cité de Toronto.

The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Bert Johnson): This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardagh Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardagh Street living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

""4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

""5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

""i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

""ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

""iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

""iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardell Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardell Avenue living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

""4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

""5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

""i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

""ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

""iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

""iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

""Public consultation

""(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arden Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

""1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arden Crescent living in the urban area.

""2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

""3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

""4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

""5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arden Thorpe Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arden Thorpe Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall stand deferred.

This also is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardgowan Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardgowan Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardmore Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardrossan Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardrossan Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

0810

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardua Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardua Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that the motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardrea Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied” —

Mrs Marion Boyd (London Centre): Please repeat and spell the name of the street in this motion.

The Second Deputy Chair: No. I will pronounce them as best I can. I don't think —

Mrs Boyd: You are speaking so fast that we cannot hear it. I request that you say it slowly and spell it if we don't understand.

The Second Deputy Chair: It's my interest to get this done as soon as possible. There is one problem; that is, members are walking between you and me, which is improper, unparliamentary, and shouldn't be tolerated. But I am doing my best to pronounce them. Do you have a copy of this in front of you?

Mrs Boyd: I do not have this one, no.

The Second Deputy Chair: It's Ardrea.

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardrea Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardwick Boulevard living in the

urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardwick Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ardworld Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ardworld Gate living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed,

say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ares Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ares Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say “aye.” All those opposed, say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argate Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argate Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argentia Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argentia Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argo Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argo Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0820

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argonaut Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argonaut Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argonne Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argonne Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argyle Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argyle Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Argyle Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Argyle Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Environment and Energy): On a point of order, Mr Chair: They didn't have the required five members on that particular vote. The member for Sudbury East is not sitting in her proper seat and therefore cannot be counted.

The Second Deputy Chair: I will remind members that they only have the privilege of being counted in the vote if they are in their own seat.

Ms Shelley Martel (Sudbury East): Point of order, Mr Chair: Then would then contradict a ruling in a debate earlier on this same question.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'll take this under consideration.

No, it does not contradict the other one. The other one was on a voice vote where there were many people giving that. It was impossible for the Chair to determine whether these people were in their own or other seats. So that was ruled. If the members wish for a division, then they must stand in their own place.

Ms Martel: Point of order, Mr Chair: I find your decision a bit difficult to understand.

The Second Deputy Chair: It's not a point of order. You are not in your own seat.

Hon Mr Sterling: If you're not in your own seat, you can't speak.

Ms Martel: Point of order, Mr Chair: I find it difficult to deal with your ruling in this sense. Either there is a rule that members can vote when they're in their own seat or

there is not. The issue is not that there were so many people in different seats that the Chair couldn't tell who was voting from their seat or not.

The question is, either there is a rule in this House that you can vote whether or not you are in your seat or there is not. It should have nothing to do with how many members were or were not sitting in their seats or whether or not the Chair could tell who was sitting where. That's completely contrary.

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to be very clear about this. When you're saying "aye" and "nay," this Chair is not about to determine every "aye" and "nay," but if you're wishing to indicate for a division, then clearly you must stand in your own place. That is my ruling.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Sterling: Mr Chair, on a point of order: In that case, there were not five members in their seats and therefore there should not be a vote —

Mrs Boyd: So what if 11,000 were deferred?

Hon Mr Sterling: That's right. Okay, that's fine.

The Second Deputy Chair: Yes. I want to address the minister. You are absolutely right. I made a mistake. I recognized the five members, even though there were only four of them in their own seats. It's my fault and I'm sorry.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arjay Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arjay Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0830

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arkley Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arkley Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.”

Mr Frank Miclash (Kenora): Point of order, Mr Chair: I do not believe we have a quorum in the House.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would you like the table to check?

Mr Miclash: I would, otherwise I would not have called a quorum.

Clerk Assistant (Ms Deborah Deller): A quorum is not present, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: “5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arkona Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arkona Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arkwright Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arkwright Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arlene Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arlene Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arleta Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arleta Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arlington Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arlington Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arlstan Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arlstan Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

0840

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armada Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armada Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armadale Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armadale Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armel Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armel Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armitage Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armitage Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armour Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armour Boulevard living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of the committee this NDP motion carry? All those in favour of the motion say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Armstrong Avenue living in the

urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Armstrong Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour of the motion say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnall Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnall Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour of the motion say "aye." Those opposed

say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arncliffe Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arncliffe Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." Those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I've just returned from our caucus office. Our staff are just getting in and they find that on their voice mail and on their live phones they are getting many calls from the public requesting that we ask the Chair to read more clearly and more slowly. They cannot understand what is happening in the House.

The Second Deputy Chair: I recognize that as a point. I would like to point out that there is a lot of repetition, and maybe they could put this up as a visual on the screen and then they could follow through it the way I'm reading.

Mrs Boyd: Further to my point of order, my understanding is that props are not within the rules of this House, so I don't think that would necessarily be appropriate. You may make that suggestion, but in the meantime, since the whole purpose of this exercise is so that the public can be part of the proceedings — the reason we have cameras in this place, the reason we broadcast is so that the public can be part of the legislative process, and the public is saying to you very clearly, you are reading too fast, you are reading in an unclear way, and they cannot follow the proceedings. You are, in other words, being contemptuous of the public's right to understand what the legislative process is all about.

0850

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): On a point of order —

The Second Deputy Chair: Is that on the same point of order?

Mr Phillips: Yes, it is, Mr Speaker. Just to be helpful to you, we are getting phone calls as well, not on exactly the same point. There are people phoning, saying that —

The Second Deputy Chair: No, no.

Mr Phillips: But it is on the same point of order, which is the phone calls —

The Second Deputy Chair: No, no. Either it is on the same point or it is not.

Mr Phillips: It is on the same point, the phone calls regarding the job you're doing, if I might speak on that. What they are saying is they have copies of a Mike Harris report before the election saying that he would keep the city of Scarborough, and now they find that you are reading amendments that indicate that we will not be keeping the city of Scarborough.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm sorry. That is not on the same point. I would like to address —

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. I am addressing the point of order of the member for London Centre.

Mr Peter Kormos (Welland-Thorold): On a point of order —

The Second Deputy Chair: Are you addressing the same point of order?

Mr Kormos: Chair, please, this is something that I've been trying to raise all morning since 6 o'clock. We've received earlier phone calls into our caucus office, into my office. I've gone upstairs into the legislative broadcast room. I've expressed concern about the translation services. I've expressed concern about Hansard and their ability to accurately record this. Your speech sounds slurred and incoherent. The member for Mississauga South, Margaret Marland, makes inferences or draws inferences about that that I don't mean to imply. All I'm saying is that it's very difficult to understand.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. Please take your seat. I'd like to address that. I think that is a different point of order. I am going to address it first. I don't consider this within the purview of the member. I have had to extend my voice overly loud to overcome some of the attention that you are not giving this House, so I will not accept that criticism. That is that point of order.

To the member for London Centre: I think that my voice is being challenged, and I don't either apologize or take any satisfaction from that. I would like to remind the member for London Centre that I am doing about 44 of these an hour, and I have been doing so since this morning at 7:10. I also did from 2 till 3:10 and two hours later last evening. So it may be a little challenging for those listening. It is also challenging for this Chair to do the reading. I will ask for your indulgence to accommodate the disability that I will be facing in the days and weeks to come.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnheim Road living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnheim Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnold Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnold Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say

"nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnold Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnold Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

The member for Nickel Belt on a point of order.

Mr Floyd Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr Chair. I was one of the fortunate MPPs who went and had a sleep last night, and I am just starting my shift now, so I'm bright-eyed and bushy-tailed as the day starts, but I must say that when I turned on my TV this morning to see what the proceeding were and how things were going, I had great difficulty understanding what was going on. I appreciate the fact that you may be fatigued yourself, but I know it would help a lot if you were to read and enunciate a little more slowly and clearly so that people could really understand and make sure their street was included in this consultation process.

The Second Deputy Chair: I can't make all the same observations that you've given about yourself, but this is quite a repetitious thing. I've ruled on it before. I would read it once very slowly and carefully if you could put ditto marks under it. You can't, so I will proceed the way that I deem best.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and The Islands): On the same point of order, Mr Chair —

The Second Deputy Chair: I've ruled on that one and I'll rule on this one.

Mr Gerretsen: I observed the exchange that took place about five or 10 minutes ago and I must admit that I was in

my office for about an hour or so, and there were a number of phone calls — I do have a special office here in this building — that came in from people who wanted to know exactly what was going on, because they could not understand your enunciation of the different motions that you're reading into the record.

Let me be the first to congratulate both you and the other two deputy Chairs for the excellent job that all of you have done throughout the night in reading these motions into the record, because I know it takes an awful lot of courage and an awful lot of intestinal fortitude to actually get through the process. But we would really appreciate it, and the people who are observing this on television would appreciate it as well, if you could just slow it down. If, let's say, you do one of them in one minute and 40 seconds rather than one minute and 20 seconds, I think the people will get a better understanding about what this process is all about.

Of course, the process is really all about trying to get the best form of government for Metropolitan Toronto, which we truly believe is the six existing governments which we have here currently.

0900

The Second Deputy Chair: You're kind of getting off the point of order, but yes, and I did rule on that before. It is not my duty to explain to everybody what is going on. My duty is to chair —

Mr Gerretsen: They don't want you to explain. They just want you to talk slower.

The Second Deputy Chair: No. I would like you to take your seat and listen, because I am ruling on your point of order. It is not my duty to explain to either you or the public what is going on, because you are supposed to know, and the public are here by a courtesy, apparently, by someone else. So I'm ruling that I've ruled on that point of order before. I don't have the ability to explain —

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: Please take your seat.

I recognize the member for Lake Nipigon. Why are you on your feet, please?

Mr Gilles Pouliot (Lake Nipigon): Pardon me?

The Second Deputy Chair: Why are you on your feet?

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: No, no. Let us be very clear.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of privilege, and also to wish you best wishes in your future endeavour.

My point of personal privilege concerns your health, and I speak with all the sincerity at my command. There I was a few minutes ago — I'll be brief, Mr Chair — in the privacy of the small cubicle that I occupy on St Joseph Street, and I was trying to follow, because it's my job to do so, all the amendments in their right order, and I became concerned about your health. I tried to listen intently, hanging on to every word you were saying. I know some of the streets are difficult to name, but they are so important that at one time I said, "There goes the neighbourhood." I don't have one of those VCR machines, so for a whole hour I became more and more concerned about your health, and it seemed to me that it's taking its toll.

So if you could possibly slow down to benefit first yourself, the members of the assembly and the general public who are hanging on every word —

The Second Deputy Chair: I think I can rule on this point of —

Mr Bud Wildman (Algoma): On the same point —

The Second Deputy Chair: No, I will rule on this one. I want to be very clear, and I can help you out in ruling on this point of privilege. It is not a point of privilege. I will do the best for my health, and I hope that all others do the same.

The member for Algoma on a point of privilege.

Mr Wildman: I just wanted to say that after being here with you since 7, there's a certain rhythm that you've demonstrated and I've gotten with it and I really am into it and I'm really enjoying it.

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to correct you. It was since 7:10 that I've been here, and that is not a point of privilege.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnold Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnold Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnott Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnott Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arnprior Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arnprior Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arran Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arran Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arrow Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arrow Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

0910

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arrowdale Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arrowdale Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

The First Deputy Chair (Ms Marilyn Churley): Good morning, everybody. It's a real pleasure to be back.

We'll start with an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arrowhead Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arrowhead Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arrowsmith Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arrowsmith Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arrowstook Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arrowstook Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Artech Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Artech Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

Mr Tony Silipo (Dovercourt): On a point of order, Madam Chair: I believe the next amendment deals with the residents of Artesian Industrial Parkway. I’d like to withdraw that amendment.

The First Deputy Chair: Okay. Withdrawn.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Madam Chair: My office just received a phone call from a watcher thanking you for your articulate and coherent delivery. Finally, this

viewer has indicated he can understand what is happening here, and he has asked me to express his gratitude and that of, I'm sure, many others. Thank you, Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4) —

Interjections.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please. Nobody will be able to hear me now. Will people come to order, please. I'm sure everybody wishes to.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arthur Griffith Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arthur Griffith Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

0920

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arthur Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arthur Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

Could I ask members to please be at your seats when you stand for division? Thank you.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Madam Chair: I received a message from Anna Ciletti Martin of Sault Ste Marie, who again expresses her gratitude to you for a clear and coherent delivery, and for whom today is also her birthday. So we wish her a happy birthday.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you. NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Artillery Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Artillery Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Artinger Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Artinger Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Artisan Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Artisan Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Artreeva Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Artreeva Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Madam Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: Point of order, member for Dovercourt.

Mr Silipo: Chair, I would just like to take a brief moment to welcome the Premier who has joined us for the sitting. I hope he finds this useful.

0930

The First Deputy Chair: NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Arundel Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Arundel Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ascolda Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ascolda Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ascot Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ascot Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing" —

Interjections.

The First Deputy Chair: Could I have order, please.

"If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Chair: It perhaps might be useful if you were to remind the members of the government that if they don't want an amendment to pass, they actually have to object to it.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you. I would say to both sides of the House that I've been —

Mr Rosario Marchese (Fort York): Wake up. Come on, do your job.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please. I would like to respond to that point of order by the member for Dovercourt. I would like to say it's a good point of order. I'd like to say to both sides of the House that you need to be vigilant and be ready to respond, because I have been a little lenient, I must confess, with both sides of the House. To be fair, we've been up all night. I know that people are tired, but it is important that everybody pay attention and be vigilant and be on cue when I call for the vote. Thank you.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ash Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ash Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashall Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashall Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

0940

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashbourne Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashbourne Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Mr Silipo: On a point of order, Chair: I believe the next amendment deals with the residents of Ashbridges Bay Park Road. I'd like to withdraw that amendment.

The First Deputy Chair: Withdrawn, thank you.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashbridges Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashbridges Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashburnham Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashburnham Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashbury Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashbury Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashby Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashby Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashcott Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashcott Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

0950

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashdale Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashdale Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashdean Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashdean Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4) —

Mr Kormos: A point of order, Chair: Here it is, it’s five minutes to 10 on Thursday morning. This House has been sitting for almost 24 hours now around the clock and will continue to sit for 24 hours around the clock. Members are rumpled, some are unshaven, tempers are flaring. In fact, this place has turned into some —

Interjections.

Mr Kormos: People have not slept, and again, sometimes the place, I understand, turns into theatre, but please, with your assistance, Chair, the public indeed are invited and entitled to attend here right now at Queen’s Park to witness this live, are they not?

The First Deputy Chair: What’s your point of order.

Mr Kormos: Are they not invited to come here to participate in this?

The First Deputy Chair: Is that your point of order?

Mr Kormos: I want to be certain that the public are invited to sit in these galleries and witness —

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you very much.

Interjections.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashfield Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashfield Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashford Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashford Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashgrove Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashgrove Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

1000

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashland Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashland Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." All those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashley Park Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashley Park Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashmill Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashmill Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." All those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashmore Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashmore Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." All those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashmount Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashmount Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say “aye.” All those opposed, please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashridge Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashridge Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, please say “aye.” All those opposed, please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

1010

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashstead Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashstead Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashton Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashton Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashtonbee Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashtonbee Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashwarren Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashwarren Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashwick Drive living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashwick Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashwood Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashwood Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it.

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): Could you defer that please, Madam Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: The vote will be deferred. Yes, thank you.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Cochrane South): On a point of order, Madam Chair: I listened intently earlier, about a half hour ago, you made the point, which I thought was quite right on your behalf as the Deputy Chair of the House, that when we're in a voice vote situation such as we are with the committee of the whole now that members have to either say they accept or they don't accept at the very beginning the amendment. I've heard now three or four votes go by. I've heard on this side of the House the people saying "aye" in favour of the motions. I haven't heard nays.

Mr Marchese: Are they not doing their job again?

Mr Bisson: Madam Speaker, just to finish the point, if the government is in agreement and then they don't say something —

Interjections.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please. I can't hear.
1020

Mr Bisson: The point I'm making, Madam Chair, just very quickly, is that if the government is not going to vote at the very beginning and it's only the opposition voting in favour, it seems to me we would have won the amendments. If the government doesn't want us to win the amendments, they should be voting against them at the very beginning.

The First Deputy Chair: Okay, thank you. I would say to the member that I'm listening carefully. Because I'm sitting in the centre, I am listening carefully to both sides of the House and I did hear, very low, but I did hear a no from over there. Frankly, if I don't hear any sound whatsoever from either side in a voice vote, then that side will have lost, but I am listening carefully. I do urge the members, even though some have been up all night, to try to pay attention and —

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): You're a good Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you, Premier. Thank you for your point of order.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ashworth Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ashworth Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aspen Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aspen Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aspendale Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aspendale Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aspenwood Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aspenwood Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Asquith Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Asquith Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Assiniboine Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Assiniboine Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

1030

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Astley Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Astley Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Astor Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Astor Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Astoria Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Astoria Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Astral Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Astral Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athabaska Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athabaska Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

1040

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athenia Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athenia Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atherton Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atherton Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athletic Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athletic Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athlone Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athlone Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended —

Hon Al Leach (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Dispense.

The First Deputy Chair: Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athlone Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athlone Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Athol Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Athol Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Hon Mr Leach: Point of order, Madam Chair: I’m sure that the House would like to know that we’re honoured today to have the mayor of Kingston with us in the members’ gallery and I’m sure that we’d just like to recognize his attendance.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you for letting us know.

1050

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atkins Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atkins Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it.

Mr Patten: Please defer the vote.

The First Deputy Chair: The vote will be deferred. What would I do without you?

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atkinson Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atkinson Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atkinson Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atkinson Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atlantic Avenue living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atlantic Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atlas Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atlas Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atlee Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atlee Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

1100

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atomic Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atomic Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atrium Lane living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atrium Lane living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Attercliff Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Attercliff Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Attila Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Attila Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atwell Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atwell Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

1110

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Atwood Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Atwood Place living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Mr Patten: On a point of order, Chair: I'd like to inform the House that we have some special guests from the Yorkdale Secondary School from North York with us this morning and I'd like to welcome them on behalf of the House.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you. That is not a point of order, but I too, on behalf of all the House, would like to welcome the students here today.

Mr Kormos: And they can come back at 11 this evening or 2 this morning. The House will still be sitting.

The First Deputy Chair: Member for Welland-Thorold.

The Chair (Mr Gilles E. Morin): We're now dealing with an NDP motion.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Auburn Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Auburn Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Another NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Auburndale Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Auburndale Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Audley Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Audley Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Audley Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Audley Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Mr Jim Brown (Scarborough West): On a point of privilege, Chair: I’d like to point out to the House that as of 11 am this morning we spent well in excess of \$200,000 on this filibuster, \$200,000 that could have been put into health care or extra policing.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. Just a minute. I’d like to remind the member that the —

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services): You don’t mind flushing taxpayers’ money down the toilet. Typical Liberal.

The Chair: Order.

1120

Interjections.

Hon Mr Runciman: Contempt for taxpayers, that’s what this is all about.

The Chair: Solicitor General. I only wish that the House would have been as lively early this morning.

Interjections.

The Chair: The member for Ottawa-Rideau, the member for Etobicoke-Humber, the member for London Centre.

Now, I’ll deal with you, sir. It was not a point of privilege; it was not a point of order.

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): I just want to assure the House that everybody on this side is very aware of the expense that’s been incurred here in this place, and I feel very strongly that democracy is worth that price. If this government is really sincerely concerned about the cost of what’s going on here, it will, as John Sewell outside said so eloquently, withdraw Bill 103.

The Chair: It’s not a point of privilege; it’s not a point of order. I will now continue with a new motion.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. I only wish the House would have been as lively at 3 o’clock this morning. Honestly, this is great, but let’s keep a bit of order.

I will now read an interesting motion from the NDP: “I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Audrelane Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Audrelane Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Audrey Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Audrey Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Audubon Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Audubon Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1130

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Augusta Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Augusta Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Augusta Square living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Augusta Square living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Auckland Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Auckland Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Auld Croft Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

Interjection.

The Chair: The member for Lake Nipigon.

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Auld Croft Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Mr Pouliot: Point of order.

The Chair: Let me finish and I’ll take your point of order.

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

I will now listen to your point of order.

Mr Pouliot: I thank you and I salute you. I need your help, as the representative of the riding of Lake Nipigon. I listened intently to every word and you did mention, while reading the resolution, sir, with high respect, Lake Nipigon. Am I to take it that Lake Nipigon is to be amalgamated, becoming part of Toronto? I need your guidance and leadership, Mr Chair.

The Chair: Thank you for seeking advice and the advice is, no. I called “Lake Nipigon” because you were out of order.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aura Lea Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aura Lea Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

Did somebody have a point of order?

Interjection: No.

The Chair: There should be no conversation between the floor and the gallery, please.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aurora Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aurora Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1140

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Austin Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Austin Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Austin Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Austin Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” All those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Austin Terrace living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Austin Terrace living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Austrey Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Austrey Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Autumn Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Autumn Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1150

A new motion from the NDP:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Autumn Glen Circle living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Autumn Glen Circle living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Chair: In the interest of time, we would like to withdraw the next motion that's in sequence before you.

The Chair: Could you tell me which one that is?

Mr Laughren: Yes. Would you like me to read it?

I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation —

The Chair: Dispense. You can dispense.

Mr Laughren: It's Avenue University.

The Chair: So be it. Does everybody agree? Agreed.

We now have a new motion from the NDP:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ava Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ava Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ava Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ava Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avalon Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avalon Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avalon Blvd living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avalon Blvd living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1200

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avalon Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avalon Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

A new NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aveline Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aveline Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avenal Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avenal Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avening Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avening Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avenue Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avenue Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1210

We’ll now deal with a new NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Averdun Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Averdon Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Averill Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Averill Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avery Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avery Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aviemore Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aviemore Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avion Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avion Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” That’s the spirit. In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1220

Mr Marchese: Mr Chair, point of order.

The Chair: I’ll wait until all members sit down, then I’ll listen to your point of order.

Mr Marchese: There is no quorum in the House and I think —

The Chair: Would you please check if there is a quorum.

Clerk at the Table (Mr Todd Decker): A quorum is not present, Chair.

The Chair ordered the bells rung.

Acting Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present, Chair.

The Chair: NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avis Crescent living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avis Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avoca Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avoca Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please

say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

A new motion, an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avon Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avon Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avon Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avon Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1230

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avon Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avon Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avon Park Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avon Park Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avondale Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avondale Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avondale Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avondale Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1240

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avonhill Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avonhill Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection: 1

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avonhurst Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avonhurst Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avonlea Blvd living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avonlea Blvd living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avonmore Square living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avonmore Square living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Avonwick Gate living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Avonwick Gate living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1250

An NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Awde Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Awde Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour will please say “aye.” Those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Axsmith Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Axsmith Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

Mr Marchese: Mr Chair, I’d like to withdraw the next motion that is about to be read.

The Chair: Which one is that?

Mr Marchese: The one that mentions the people of Ayles Lake.

The Chair: Is it agreed? It is withdrawn. It doesn’t have to be agreed; it is withdrawn.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aylesbury Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aylesbury Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.” All those opposed will please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aylesford Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aylesford Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay."

Did I hear a "nay"?

Interjections: Nay.

The Chair: In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred. Thank you.

1300

A new motion, NDP motion: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aylesworth Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aylesworth Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion: "I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aymarn Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aymarn Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ayr Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ayr Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ayre Point Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ayre Point Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

1310

Mr Patten: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: As has been the custom, I would like to point out to the Legislature today that we have a guest in the Speaker's gallery, Margaret Campbell, former member of the Legislature.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would members of the Legislature show their appreciation to Miss Campbell.

Tell me why you're up, so that —

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Parkdale): Since we're in the introductory phase —

The Second Deputy Chair: No, no.

Mr Ruprecht: — we do have another person who's very important to the —

The Second Deputy Chair: Pardon me. Will you please take your seat. What I want is, when somebody stands up, you're either coming in and out of the Legislature or you're up for two reasons: One is a point of order; the other is a point of privilege. Just if you'd tell me why you're up — I don't want to be difficult, that's —

Mr Ruprecht: I appreciate that. It's a point of order and I know you're not being difficult.

The Second Deputy Chair: Thank you. No.

Mr Ruprecht: You're trying to be very cooperative.

The Second Deputy Chair: I recognize the member for Parkdale on a point of order.

Mr Ruprecht: I wanted to point out to the House we do have another very important person here from the riding of Parkdale, Mrs Nellie Pekovic. We certainly want to welcome her because these proceedings are very important and consequently we would like to ensure that all these people are welcomed to the sitting.

The Second Deputy Chair: Maybe we'll just say hello then and that would be great. Thank you.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Azalea Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Azalea Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Aziel Street living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Aziel Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Azrock Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Azrock Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.”

Order, please. If you'd just keep it down a little bit so I can hear a little bit better.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request that this committee pass this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say

“nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Babcock Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Babcock Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Babington Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Babington Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

Mr Marchese: Chair, I would like to withdraw the motion that we’re about to read into the record.

The Second Deputy Chair: Do you want to explain why you’re withdrawing it?

Mr Marchese: Absolutely. This particular motion doesn’t have a name of a street and therefore I felt it was appropriate to withdraw it.

The Second Deputy Chair: I think that’s legitimate.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baby Point Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baby Point Crescent living in the urban area.”

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, order. I have to enunciate, pronounce and get this information out.

Mr Marchese: We don’t want to discourage you, Mr Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. I can’t have people talking at full voice over mine. I will not tolerate it.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Fort William): You’re absolutely right.

The Second Deputy Chair: Bring yourself to order, please.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

1320

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baby Point Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baby Point Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baby Point Terrace living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baby Point Terrace living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bachelor Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bachelor Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baden Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baden Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Badger Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Badger Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this NDP motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Badgerow Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Badgerow Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baffin Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baffin Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bagot Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bagot Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

1330

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bagwell Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bagwell Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bailey Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied."

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, please. There are too many conversations going on, too close that I cannot hear properly. I'd ask you to whisper a little bit, especially those really close to me.

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bailey Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bain Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bain Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of order, Mr Chair: The same person who expressed some concern about the state of your health, and you've been under a state of seige by virtue of what the government is intending to do, Joan Niemi, a proud resident in the riding of Lake Nipigon, the township of Schreiber, is pleading with the government vis-à-vis amalgamation.

She's been glued to her television set. She'd concerned about health because you've been going around the clock like a soldier at your post and she's equally concerned that these kinds of downloading and ramifications will take on extraordinary proportions. She's frightened in the township of Schreiber by this government and by Bill 103.

The Second Deputy Chair: Please take your seat. I wanted to explain my reasoning. The state of my health, I feel, is fantastic. I'm not going to around the clock. We work on two-hour shifts; we have four hours off. I hope that you pass that along, but I am required to read this page. We have to read each one with two words different on each one. My ruling is that is not a point of order.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: You're standing up.

Mr Marchese: Point of order.

The Second Deputy Chair: You're withdrawing this one?

Mr Marchese: I'm going to explain it so that you follow me.

The Second Deputy Chair: No, you're not.

Mr Marchese: I'm not going to explain it?

The Second Deputy Chair: No. You're either going to withdraw it or rise properly or sit down.

Mr Marchese: I would like to withdraw the next two motions and I was going to explain it to you, if you like. If not, it's okay.

The Second Deputy Chair: No.

Mr Marchese: No? Okay. The next one says Bainbridge Avenue. Okay?

The Second Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bainbridge Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bainbridge Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bainhart Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bainhart Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: You can hear okay now?

Mr Marchese: I came closer so that I could hear you clearly.

The Second Deputy Chair: The problem with the member for Welland-Thorold is, there was a member standing up between us. So I'd ask you to take your seats, please.

Mr Kormos: I'm trying to hear.

The Second Deputy Chair: "3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

The member for Welland-Thorold, you have trouble hearing? Is there a way for us to direct them to turn the volume up on the mike?

Mr Kormos: Point of order, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: Just before you get into your point of order, I want to suggest to you that the request to turn up the volume has been made and apparently it's going at full speed. I'm sorry. We can't do anything more for you.

Mr Marchese: Slow down.

Mr Kormos: Point of order: I appreciate that throughout the course of my life I may have suffered some modest

hearing loss. Others do. It's a part of living in an industrial community, for instance, and a part of the aging process. However, Chair, I ask you to contrast the clarity with which your co-chair Ms Churley was able to read these without the rapidity. She wasn't trying to turn this into a race. She was enunciating clearly. She wasn't trying to impress her caucus and curry favour with them.

A whole lot of people can't understand what you're saying because in your eagerness to speed this up, you're slurring the words so that they become incoherent, incomprehensible.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order.

Mr Kormos: I speak not only for myself but for hundreds of people who've been calling —

The Second Deputy Chair: Would you please take your seat. Member for Welland-Thorold, I want to be very specific. I consider your comments an insult to this chair and to the people who have occupied it during the past few days and I will not tolerate it any more.

Mr Pouliot: But they want to know —

The Second Deputy Chair: You will come to order.

Mr Pouliot: They're watching TV.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. I do not think that is your intention, but I will not tolerate you to bring into disrespect this Chair or the occupants of it.

Mrs Boyd: Point of order, Mr Chair: Are you going to be reading the entire motion that we are now on at this point because if you're starting in the middle, I'm not sure which one we're on and I'm supposed to be keeping track.

The Second Deputy Chair: You're insinuating that I have missed the odd word?

Mrs Boyd: No. No, not at all. I am afraid that I may have missed one and I'm just wondering which one you're on and whether you're reading the whole motion this time.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm endeavouring to.

Mrs Boyd: Thank you.

1340

The Second Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bainhart Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bainhart Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister" —

The member for Algoma, you are standing in between members who have indicated a difficulty in hearing and understanding me. It's fine, except I am extending my voice to try to do that. First of all, they aren't listening and the second thing is, you're interfering. I'm trying to both project my voice to them there and through this, so I'm trying doubly hard to make them hear, understand and so on. I would ask your indulgence in accommodating —

Mr Wildman: I will do everything possible to bend over whenever I stand up in future —

The Second Deputy Chair: Just be careful which direction you are.

Mr Wildman: — so that I'm not between you and the other speakers.

The Second Deputy Chair: Thank you. Member for London Centre, whereabouts was I?

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: I think I was at 4.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands defeated.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baintree Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baintree Court living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands defeated.

Mr Pouliot: Mr Chair, please, with respect, one, two, three — quatro, cinco, six, siete.

The Second Deputy Chair: I don't want to rush, but there have to be five standing in order to request a division. I looked up. There were only four.

Mr Wildman: That was because I was bending over.

Interjections.

Mr Pouliot: We didn't come out of a hat. We were here standing up.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is my ruling. You may appeal.

Mr Pouliot: The motion is defeated for a fraction — what about intent and spirit?

The Second Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baintree Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baintree Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baird Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baird Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mrs Boyd: Point of order, Mr Chair: It's my understanding that as we go through committee of the whole it is essential for either the minister or one of his parliamentary assistants to be present in the House. I don't believe that's the case at the moment. I wonder if you could rule on that.

The Second Deputy Chair: My ruling is that is not a point of order and they don't have to be here.

Mr Wildman: Actually it's out of order to mention their absence.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order, please.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bairstow Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bairstow Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

1350

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baker Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baker Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bakersfield Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bakersfield Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bakerton Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bakerton Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the ayes — the nays have it. I think it was a nay.

Mrs Boyd: You were right the first time, Mr Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bala Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bala Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balaby Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balaby Crescent living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balacava Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied” —

The Chair recognizes the member for Algoma.

Mr Wildman: I was just concerned about what happened to the person in the front, but she seems okay.

The Second Deputy Chair: They will get looked after, but you are also standing in the way between me and

people who have indicated a great deal of difficulty hearing me. I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Mr Kormos: He wasn't standing in my way.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order.

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner" — I've read that.

"2. The minister has considered" — I think I read that.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing" — this also sounds familiar — "has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mrs Boyd: Point of order, Mr Chair: In the middle of reading section 3 of the previous one, I believe you added some words. Are they meant to be part of the motion? I believe you said, "This sounds familiar."

Mr Ruprecht: That's right.

Mrs Boyd: Is that part of the motion?

The Second Deputy Chair: No. I was reminding myself whereabouts I had left off to start again because I had been interrupted partway through.

Mrs Boyd: I was confused because it wasn't on my sheet.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is a point of order.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balcarras Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents" —

The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr Wildman: I recognize him too.

Interjection: Peter Kormos.

The Second Deputy Chair: I have difficulty of knowing when you're standing up if you're on a point of order, if you're trying to get my attention.

Mr Kormos: If I'm on a point of order, I'll address the Chair to that effect.

The Second Deputy Chair: But it is very confusing to me. I look up and, as you can see — I'll have to some different way of knowing if somebody's going to stand up

all the time and when I have to recognize when they're standing on a point of order.

Mr Kormos: I'm anticipating the recorded vote.

1400

The Second Deputy Chair: "The minister has given notice of" — is that where I was — "the proposed regulation, in a manner" — and that was not part of the motion — "that will come to the attention of the residents of Balcarras Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP —

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to address a very grave concern, to the member for Welland-Thorold. I'll allow you to stand, but if you're going to address comments and stand, then I'll not tolerate it.

Mr Kormos: My apologies, Mr Chair, I'll —

The Second Deputy Chair: I'll accept your apologies, thanks.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balding Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balding Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

- “5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,
- “i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
- “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,
- “iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,
- “iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Martin: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I’ve been in my office listening to you for the last while and I have to say, in respect for a number of people out there who are elderly, hard of hearing, and who are very interested in what’s going on here because they’re concerned about the process and democracy and what’s happening to their communities — as a matter of fact, I had two faxes from a couple of constituents in my own community who are watching this with keen interest and want to know what’s going on. Sault Ste Marie —

The Second Deputy Chair: I want to get on with this. Is it they don’t understand or they can’t hear?

Mr Martin: This is a point of order. They’re having a hard time understanding. I just want you to hear what they have to say. It says here — it’s from Gus and Mary Morrison — “Tony, tell Bert Johnson to speak more clearly and quit goofing off. We cannot understand him. If he is tired, let him leave the House and have someone else come in. He is only doing this to antagonize those people who presented these bills. Thanks, Gus.” Then there’s another one a little while later. It says: “Tony, regardless of how many bills the Chair has read, the next one he reads is the first one and should be read as slowly as the first one. Every one is a new one. Thanks, Gus.”

I offer that to you, Bert, as some suggestion re my concern for people out there who want to know what it is that we as an opposition party are presenting by way of amendment to these very significant bills. So I hope you will take that into account as you move forward.

The Second Deputy Chair: I certainly will. I’ve ruled on this before. I can’t do anything about the volume, so if you can’t hear I can’t do anything about it. My mannerism is such that I don’t enjoy all of this. Would you please take your seat while I’m explaining to you. I’m ruling on your point. Such is my way of doing it. I’d like you to know that I have read 40 of these in the last 55 minutes. There are only two words’ difference on them, so it is kind of repetitive. I’m sure you’ll —

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. When I’m explaining this to the member, I gather that you will relay that on to constituents who have indicated an interest.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baldoon Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baldoon Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote shall be deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baldwin Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baldwin Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the request of this committee —

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre): On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I would just like to raise the fact with you that there are more calls coming in. We’ve received another 20 calls in the last little while about the

speed at which you're speaking and they're asking you to slow down the auction. People are offended, Speaker, and I urge you to please show the respect that the Chair has indicated the amendments deserve and therefore the people deserve. Please, read them a little more clearly out of deference to this place and the process that we're in.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is a point of order and I've ruled on it before.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection" — oh, no.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You've already read Baldwin Street, if that is the one you were on, and you were at the point of asking for the vote.

The Second Deputy Chair: Good heavens, a terrible mistake. Thanks very much for pointing that out. That is a point of order.

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baleberry Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baleberry Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

1410

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bales Avenue living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bales Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balford Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balford Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balfour Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balfour Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballacaine Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballacaine Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballantyne Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballantyne Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballater Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballater Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: Je vous remercie profondément.

The Second Deputy Chair: Uno momento.

Mr Pouliot: [Remarks in Spanish]

The Second Deputy Chair: I need French on here.

Mr Pouliot: [Remarks in Spanish]

The Second Deputy Chair: Order. I will address your point of order when I get a translation.

You have a point of order?

Mr Pouliot: Yes.

The Second Deputy Chair: And will you address it to me in English?

Mr Pouliot: In English, and I will speak slowly. Mr Speaker, with high respect for your office and with respect for you, sir, our caucus has just received no less than 15 phone calls in the last 20 minutes, sir, and every one of those 15 calls to our caucus offices has respectfully requested that you please attempt to slow down. This is a public domain product. People are glued to their television set and they're trying to follow all the serious amendments. You will of course agree, Mr Speaker, again with high respect, sir, that the subject matter, the amendments that are being debated here, go to the very heart of the legislation which is being put forth by the government. We would encourage you, sir, for public consumption so we can all understand the process and for your own goodwill and benefit and good health, because we're concerned about your health, that you slow down so we can hear.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to address —

Mr Pouliot: Thank you, sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: First of all, I think my health is fine. If it isn't, I'll be the first one to know. The second is that I'm reading these for the benefit of the members here and they're being broadcast, I understand, to somebody else for some other reason; I don't know or care about that. I want to make sure that you hear and understand it. Actually, I think I read the first several hundred of these word for word, the 250 words that they are, about. I read them fairly slowly just so people would get the general gist of it. After the next few hundred come along and they're word for word, then I don't — if I'm going a little bit fast, I'm sure you'll explain to your constituents why it is that I do. It's my nature. I'm sorry for my nature, but my nature is within me. That was a point of order.

1420

Mr Silipo: On a separate point of order, Mr Chairman: I find a bit troubling your comment. I'm not questioning your ruling on the issue raised by my colleague from Lake Nipigon, but your point with respect to the televising of the

proceedings. I think you said something to the effect you don't know why, for whose purpose or to whom they're being televised.

The Second Deputy Chair: No, I know exactly why. I just don't know if they are, because I don't have a television here. So I just assume they are.

Mr Silipo: I would assume, sir, you would know, not just as a member of this place, but as one of the presiding officers, that the proceedings of the committee of the whole, just like the proceedings of the House, are being televised. So the point that is being raised from time to time and the reason, and I think you would agree with me, why that is the case is because there was a decision made by this Parliament a long time ago now, supported I believe by all three parties of the House at that time, that there was merit to televising these proceedings so the public would be able to follow what we, their elected representatives, would be doing. The point and the principle behind that is that people, in following, have to have the ability to understand what is going on.

The reason we continue to raise with you, sir, the point about not speaking as quickly as you do, while we appreciate and understand what you are trying to do, which is to do your job to get us through the proceedings in an efficient way, we do need to underline with you that in fact it is important. That's why the whole proceedings exist in the televised fashion, to ensure that people in the public who are not able to be here present in the galleries to see what is going on, have an ability through their television screens and monitors to be able to follow the proceedings. Part of that means being able to follow what people are saying, in this case, you, as the Chair, reading the amendments that have been moved.

In asking you to slow down a little bit to the point where people can understand the words you are saying, that's the point we are making and, more important, that's the point the people calling in to our offices are making. We are relaying to you on their behalf. I would just ask that you take that into account because, quite frankly, it doesn't gain anybody anything if you go through, as you said earlier, some 44 amendments in 50 minutes and then through the points of order that are raised you lose any time you think you've gained by doing that. The point is you're not reading them just for our benefit. This is the point I want to come back to in terms of the televising of the proceedings. You are not reading them just for the benefit of the members present; you're also reading them for the benefit of the public that's following. I would just ask you to keep that in mind.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm reading them to the best of my ability. I'm trying to project my voice. I'm trying to enunciate, pronounce. They are very repetitive. You are probably familiar with the wording. They are word for word, over and it.

My point was that when I'm in the chair I cannot know whether or not it's being broadcast. When I'm out, if I'm not sleeping, then I can turn on the TV and know. Nobody has told me this is being broadcast right now.

Mr Wildman: Believe us, Chair. It is being broadcast. Just believe us. It is being broadcast.

The Second Deputy Chair: I'll take your word for it. Where was I?

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balliol Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balliol Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballyconnor Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballyconnor Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballymena Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballymena Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Ballyronan Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Ballyronan Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the request of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred. So are the motions.

1430

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balmer Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balmer Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balmoral Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balmoral Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balmuto Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balmuto Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balmy Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balmy Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balsam Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balsam Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We'd like to withdraw the next motion.

The Second Deputy Chair: I understand. It is withdrawn. It is all the ones who reside in Balsam Lake; all the residents in Balsam Lake.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Balsam Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Balsam Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Mr Christopherson: On a point of order, Mr Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: The Chair recognizes the member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr Christopherson: Thank you, Mr Chair. I appreciate your recognition. I would like to raise with you, sir, the fact that Jenny McKay, Wayne Andrews, Hector Ambola, Diane Owens, Alex Rittler and Connie White have all called our offices to also ask us to raise the issue of how quickly you are reading these.

I would remind you, Chair, that our concern is not so much the volume per se as it is the speed and the lack of respect, which I am sure is not intentionally your motivation, but that is what is happening. I would you ask you, sir, to please read the amendments in a manner that respects the recognition and honour, quite frankly, that amendments deserve, particularly when they have been ruled in order 100% bona fide business before this Legislature by our esteemed Speaker. Sir, on behalf of these Ontarians, I ask you to respect the wishes of a growing number of people who are very concerned.

The Second Deputy Chair: I will ask you to withdraw your comment impugning the motives of the Chair. I will give you that opportunity.

Mr Christopherson: I believe I was making the point that your motives were not to be questioned, but, sir, out of respect for your position I, of course, withdraw.

Interjection.

The Second Deputy Chair: I've ruled on that point of order before.

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would argue that you should go at a reasonable pace because it's costing \$10,000 an hour to operate this place. It's costing taxpayers an awful lot of money.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. That is not a point of order.

Mr Wildman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would just point out for all of us and all and sundry, that the easiest way to bring this to a close is for the government to respect the referendum vote and withdraw the bill.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is not a point of order.
1440

Mr Howard Hampton (Rainy River): On a point of order, Speaker: The House would meet at this time. This is ordinary time for the House to meet. I believe the government should respect the 76% of the people who voted against their legislation as well.

The Second Deputy Chair: That is not a point of order. All those in favour of this motion. Those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baltic Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baltic Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Baltray Crescent living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Baltray Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this House this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bamber Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bamber Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bambi Trail living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bambi Trail living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bamboo Grove living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bamboo Grove living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This motion stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bamburgh Circle living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bamburgh Circle living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote stands deferred.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: I've been approached by several members of the members' gallery. Some have obtained ear pieces, and receiving and amplification devices.

The Second Deputy Chair: Your point of order?

Mr Kormos: Yes, sir. Several others have complained that they couldn't understand the Speaker or indicated that, like me, it couldn't be a matter of the Speaker speaking too quickly, but they must be hard of hearing, as the Speaker indicated I was. Would the Speaker please arrange for these people to receive those amplification devices, as is their right. They're told that no more are available to them.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would you please take your seat. I've ruled on that point of order before.

1450

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, please, on a point of order: They need hearing devices. They advised me and other members to use hearing devices. Seven participants in that gallery have requested hearing devices. They're being denied to them. Speaker, it's within your purview to ensure that they receive those and it's your obligation to do so.

The Second Deputy Chair: My apologies for anybody who doesn't hear or understand, but this is my manner. I'm sorry.

An NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bamford Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bamford Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The Second Deputy Chair: A new point of order?

Mr Kormos: Yes, sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold on a new point of order.

Mr Kormos: Chair, we've just received a telephone call advising us that many of the names of the streets are names that were given to those streets in commemoration of veterans of the First and Second World Wars who gave their lives for their country. This caller has identified some of those names, with difficulty, as those very veterans who paid the supreme sacrifice for us.

The Second Deputy Chair: Okay. I get your point of order.

Mr Kormos: I submit as a point of order, in accordance with this caller —

The Second Deputy Chair: Would the member take his seat. I'd like to explain my ruling.

Mr Kormos: — that those names be treated with respect.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would the member please take his seat while I'm explaining the point of order.

I would like to apologize right now for every one of the names, if there's any street that I have mispronounced, either through ignorance or whatever on my part, and I

apologize. I apologize for all those that I may have in the past and any that I may in the future, and I'm very sorry.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banbury Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied — I'm sorry, I'm going to interrupt myself. That was a point of order and I have ruled on it.

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banbury Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry?

Mrs Boyd: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: Prior to our motion, could you confirm for me which one we're on. Is this Banbury Road or Bancroft Avenue that we're reading now?

The Second Deputy Chair: Banbury Road.

Mrs Boyd: Thank you. I wasn't sure whether I had missed one.

The Second Deputy Chair: Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bancroft Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bancroft Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing

has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this House this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banda Sq living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied” —

Mr Kormos: That’s “Square.” S-q is short form for “Square,” sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: This is Banda Sq. If it were a short form, it would have a period.

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banda Square living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this House this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banff Road living in the urban area

shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banff Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour say “aye.” All those opposed say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The Second Deputy Chair: The Chair recognizes the member for Lake Nipigon. On a new point of order?

Mr Pouliot: On a new point of order; also by way of an update, if I may. You will recall about half an hour ago approximately, Mr Speaker, you encouraged me to — and I tried in Spanish — en español — I tried in French, and then, finally, I somewhat succeeded, with your cooperation, in English in a very, very deliberate manner to get the point of order across. I want to speak again to that point because I think it’s important.

The Second Deputy Chair: What is the point?

Mr Pouliot: The point is, sir, I’ve received in the last 20 minutes eight calls: a call from Wapekeka, Wunnummin Lake, Summer Beaver in the great riding of Lake Nipigon. I’ve received a total of eight calls.

The Second Deputy Chair: I still don’t know what your point of order is.

Mr Pouliot: People are saying to me through Cree and Ojibwa, “Will you please slow down,” so they can keep up with all those serious amendments. They’re concerned about your health, sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: I’d like to rule on that point of order now. Would you take your seat, please.

I have ruled on that point of order before.

This is an NDP motion —

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chairman.

1500

The Second Deputy Chair: The Chair recognizes the member for Welland-Thorold on a point of order.

Mr Kormos: Speaker, with your guidance, could the Chair confirm that these telephone calls are being made to 416-325-8300 here in Toronto?

The Second Deputy Chair: That is not a point of order.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bangor Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied" —

The member for Welland-Thorold is standing and he's talking. Are you talking to me?

Mr Kormos: No.

The Second Deputy Chair: Then would you please take your seat or stop talking; one or the other, please. I'm doing the best I can. You have had several complaints and I don't want you to be the cause of me making a mistake. This is a very tedious business.

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bangor Road living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." Those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banigan Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banigan Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bank Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bank Street living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

Ms Lankin: Mr Speaker, point of order: It's a request for unanimous consent. I've been receiving messages. I received a message from Kathleen Dunphy, who has lived for 33 years on Austin Crescent and raised nine children there who still come back home, and she's very upset because she had to leave for a short while. She missed Austin Crescent and would like us to return and to repeat Austin Crescent. I'd like to ask unanimous consent if we could do that, Mr Speaker.

The Second Deputy Chair: Is there unanimous consent? Sorry, there is no unanimous consent.

Mr Kormos: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: The residents of Austin Crescent undoubtedly called 416-325-8300 to convey that message. Is that true?

The Second Deputy Chair: I'm a very patient person. I was here for two hours late last night; I was here for two

hours through the night; I was here for two hours early this morning; I've been here an hour and 55 or 56 minutes now. I have gone through five, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70 of them. I'm doing the best I can and I do not appreciate the member for Welland-Thorold interrupting on points of order that are not points of order to telecast the telephone number that I don't know anything about.

Mr Kormos: I apologize, Chair.

The Second Deputy Chair: The Chair accepts your apology.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bankfield Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bankfield Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote is deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bankview Cir living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied" —

Mr Kormos: Chair, on a point of order: "Cir" is an abbreviation for "Circle." It's Bankview Circle.

The Second Deputy Chair: No, I'm going to rule on your point of order.

Mr Kormos: "Cr" is "Crescent," "Cir" is "Circle."

Mr Christopherson: And "Sq" is "Square."

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to rule on your point of order. I'm just reading what's in front of me and the English that I took said that if it was a short form, it would have a period at the end of it.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1."

Interjections.

The Second Deputy Chair: Would the member for Welland-Thorold come to order, please; would the member for Beaches-Woodbine come to order. I don't intend to try to yell or project my voice more than I already am and I'll have to have a little bit of quietness in order that you can hear, that you can understand, you can get the enunciation and the pronunciation.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee that this motion carry? All those in favour say "aye." All those opposed say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

This is an NDP motion:

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bankwell Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bankwell Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing."

Mr Christopherson: Point of order Mr Chair: I appreciate you recognizing me. I would just bring to your attention that for some reason — I don't know whether it's a mechanical failure or the season — I notice in the public galleries there are an awful lot of people who are fanning themselves. Clearly they're uncomfortable. I wonder if you could direct, as the presiding officer of this place at this moment, that this be looked into, because there's no need for them to be that discomfited when they want to participate. Take a look, Speaker. They're fanning away. We need to make sure they're as comfortable as they can be. This is their place.

1510

The Second Deputy Chair: I'd like to address that as a point of order, because it is something that I want to address. We do welcome those who would like to be involved in the public hearings. I will not prohibit fanning. But if it becomes a demonstration, I will clear the galleries.

Mr Christopherson: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I'm sure the Chair would not want to misinterpret my comments. It was meant to be nothing other than a recognition that they are very, very warm. I would ask if you could direct that this be looked into so that the public can be comfortable in their public building. It's not code for anything, Chair. Don't be quite so paranoid, sir.

The Second Deputy Chair: On your point of order, the Sergeant at Arms is in charge of the chamber. He has heard you. He will do the best he can.

Mr Christopherson: Chair —

The Second Deputy Chair: Oh, don't worry about that, just talk to me; I can hear you.

Mr Christopherson: I want to make sure that I have the proper attention. I just wanted to thank you for recognizing that was why I raised it. I appreciate very much and I know the public appreciates anything you can do to make this place as comfortable as possible for the people who own it. Thank you.

The Second Deputy Chair: I would like to caution that if the Sergeant at Arms is successful with the air-conditioning, then I will interpret the fanning as a demonstration. Whereabouts was I?

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the wish of this committee this motion carry? All those in favour, say "aye." All those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. This vote stands deferred.

I will be relinquishing the chair now. I just wanted to report that in the last two hours I have read 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 74 identical motions, with the streets. I do want to apologize if I've gone too fast, if somebody has misunderstood, if they haven't heard, and I want to apologize for mispronunciations of any names. Thank you very much.

The First Deputy Chair: This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banmoor Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of

the residents of Banmoor Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bannatyne Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bannatyne Drive living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion, say "aye." Those opposed, say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4): Dispense? No.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bannerman Street living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bannerman Street living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

1520

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bannockburn Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bannockburn Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bannock Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bannock Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. Deferred vote.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bansley Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bansley Avenue living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,
 “ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Mr Pouliot: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I want to point out that I had the opportunity, because someone from the media, from Radio-Canada, asked me to go outside — and I’ll be candid, I’m seeking your guidance and leadership in this affair. With respect to the government, there seems to be an acquiescence. People are saying, “What are the chances, Mr Pouliot, that the government will withdraw both Bill 103 and Bill 104, go back to the drawing board and come back after much more consultation?” Not only the media, they’re responding to many phone calls that we’ve been getting through our office all the way to northern Ontario. People are scared. These bills taken on extraordinary proportions. The impact affects everybody, not only in Toronto but all over the province.

The First Deputy Chair: Member for Lake Nipigon, what is your point of order?

Mr Pouliot: The point of order can best be treated under the auspices, the tutelage, of article 22(b), paragraph 1, and trust you will reserve judgement on my point of order.

The First Deputy Chair: To the member for Lake Nipigon, I have some doubts about the relevance to that section. I will check it, but what you raised is not a point of order and we will now continue with the amendment.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banstock Drive living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banstock Drive living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Mr Pouliot: Madam Chair, on a point of order: Please, I rely on your good trust. I just received a message, and it’s open for verification, please: “Gilles, people are calling from riding re megacity. All fully support it and think you’re doing a great job.” They’re talking about our party, Madam.

Mrs Olive of Schreiber called to complain that Bert Johnson was talking too fast. She believes he is doing so on purpose. “Do not hesitate to mention my name.”

Also, a gentleman from Kitchener called to congratulate you. He also complained that Bert, our deputy, deputy, Deputy Chair, is going too fast and he can’t follow the importance of each and every amendment. It may be a matter of record, but people are watching, watching the bill, watching them, the government across.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you very much for your point of order, member for Lake Nipigon. I suggest that you take that up with that particular Deputy Chair when he is at the table.

Hon Mr Leach: I’d like to comment on that point of order, because I think it’s totally unfair to criticize a Chair who has left the chair. The Chair who was in the chair previous to you ruled on that point of order, ruled it out of order on a number of occasions, as the member who raised the point of order was aware. So he should withdraw it completely.

1530

Interjection.

The First Deputy Chair: Member for Beaches-Woodbine, come to order.

Feel free, by the way, if you can’t hear me, to let me know. I will endeavour to speak louder.

I would say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, essentially I ruled that point by the member for Lake Nipigon out of order and suggested that if there’s a concern, it be taken up with that particular deputy.

Let’s get back to the amendments at hand. We have a lot to do here.

Ms Lankin: A lot? How much is a lot, Madam Chair?

The First Deputy Chair: Come to order, member for Beaches-Woodbine.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Banton Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Banton Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Madam Chair: I have two matters to raise with you. First, we're receiving calls at (416) 325-8300 indicating that the present Chair, yourself, is very good, speaks clearly and slowly and in a manner that respects the public and respects the legislative process. A number of those calls have been received at 325-8300.

The First Deputy Chair: Member for Welland-Thorold, that is not a point of order. Let's hear your second point.

Mr Kormos: My second point of order is that I went up into the galleries, and I confirm to you, Chair, as my colleague from Hamilton Centre rose on recently, that it is excessively hot up there. The legislative security are trying to prop doors open so there can be some modest air circulation, but it's unfair to members of the public. It's oppressively hot. They are doing their best, and they also appreciate that you're speaking slowly, but they're having difficulty hearing as well because of the inadequacy of the PA system. I raise that with you, Chair, so you can deal with it appropriately.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you very much. On your first point, that is not a point of order. On your second point, I understand that security is in the process of opening windows and trying to deal with that problem.

I do want to come back to the issue of my being heard. I will do my best to make sure that you can hear me. I would like for all people in the House to hear me. There is a problem for all of us Speakers. We are taking turns sitting here every two hours, with four-hour breaks. There are times, I have to confess, when I deliberately lower my voice to save it, so that in the event we're here tomorrow and the day after and the day after, I am able to still — and I would image that the other deputies, in terms of the level, the volume of the voice, are in the same position. So I would ask that you bear with all of us in terms of helping us preserve our voices so that we can get you through these thousands of amendments over the next while. I would ask your indulgence in that. Thank you.

Mr Kormos: I just want to thank you, and I appreciate your comments. I lower my voice from time to time too for much the same reason.

The First Deputy Chair: Thank you very much. Now, shall we get back to our —

Mr Pouliot: Madam Chair, on a point of order: We know that time is of the essence. I will not prolong this, but to prepare yourself mentally and physically for the task ahead is indeed sage. It's very, very wise indeed, and we will try to help as much as we possibly can in the days and weeks ahead.

The First Deputy Chair: I very much appreciate that, and the way you can best help me now is to let me get on with reading these important amendments.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barbados Boulevard living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barbados Boulevard living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barbara Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barbara Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

1540

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barber Greene Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barber Greene Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say “aye.” Those opposed to the motion please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barberry Place living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barberry Place living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barclay Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barclay Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bards Walkway living in the urban

area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bards Walkway living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

This is an NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bardsea Court living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bardsea Court living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Should the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

An NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Bardwell Crescent living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Bardwell Crescent living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

"iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent."

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour please say "aye." Those opposed please say "nay." In my opinion, the nays have it. The motion lost; I'm sorry.

1550

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

"I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Public consultation

"(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barfield Avenue living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

"1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barfield Avenue living in the urban area.

"2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

"3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

"4. The minister shall give three weeks' notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

"5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

"i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

"ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

"iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed to the motion please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barford Road living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barford Road living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote shall be deferred.

NDP motion, subsection 24(4):

“I move that section 24 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public consultation

“(4) Despite subsection (1), no regulation that may affect the residents of Barkdene Hills living in the urban area shall be made unless the following conditions have first been satisfied:

“1. The minister has given notice of the proposed regulation, in a manner that will come to the attention of the residents of Barkdene Hills living in the urban area.

“2. The minister has considered all written submissions made by members of the public that his office received within 30 days after the notice was given.

“3. If 10 or more persons requested a public hearing within 30 days after the notice was given, a public hearing has been held and the minister has considered all oral submissions made at the hearing.

“4. The minister shall give three weeks’ notice of a public hearing, in the same manner as the notice under paragraph 1.

“5. The notice under paragraph 1 shall,

“i. include a copy of the proposed regulation,

“ii. tell members of the public where and how to obtain, without charge, a copy of this act together with background material,

“iii. advise members of the public of their rights under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4,

“iv. advise members of the public where their written submissions and requests for a public hearing should be sent.”

Shall the motion carry? All those in favour of the motion please say “aye.” Those opposed please say “nay.” In my opinion, the nays have it. The vote will be deferred.

Report continues in volume E.

CONTENTS

Thursday 3 April 1997

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE
City of Toronto Act, 1996,
Bill 103, *Mr Leach*

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 3 avril 1997

COMITÉ PLÉNIER DE
L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
Loi de 1996 sur la cité de Toronto,
projet de loi 103, *M. Leach*

